

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF GNOSTIC THEOLOGY  
WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE  
APOCRYPHON OF JOHN IRENAEUS ADVERSUS  
HAERESSES I 29 AND 30 AND RELATED TEXTS**

Alastair Hendry Black Logan

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD  
at the  
University of St Andrews



1980

Full metadata for this item is available in  
St Andrews Research Repository  
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

Please use this identifier to cite or link to this item:

<http://hdl.handle.net/10023/13648>

This item is protected by original copyright

## ABSTRACT

of

"The Development of Gnostic Theology with special reference to the Apocryphon of John, Irenaeus adversus haereses I 29 and 30 and related texts." Ph.D thesis of Alastair H.B. Logan, January 1980.

This thesis is a literary-critical and theological analysis of the Apocryphon of John and the closely related material found in Irenaeus adversus haereses I 29 and 30. It attempts to determine (1) which of the four Coptic versions in two recensions is nearest to the original, and what the precise relationship of the Apocryphon is to Irenaeus' two chapters; (2) whether the Apocryphon represents a process of Christianization or de-Christianization, and (3) what the precise relationship of the Apocryphon is to Valentinianism.

The first two chapters, on Gnostic theogony and cosmogony, argue that one can best explain the relation between the Apocryphon and Irenaeus I 29 by assuming that Irenaeus' account represents an earlier, less-developed form of the main traditions found in the Apocryphon which the latter modified to suit its own different theological tendency. The short recension, and particularly the version in Nag Hammadi Codex III, is closest to the original and to Irenaeus' account, the long representing a harmonising and spiritualising interpretation, but also containing more





ProQuest Number: 10166647

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



ProQuest 10166647

Published by ProQuest LLC (2017). Copyright of the Dissertation is held by the Author.

All rights reserved.

This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code  
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 – 1346

original traditions omitted by the short.

Chapters three, four and five deal in more general terms with the relationship between the Apocryphon and Irenaeus I 30 and cover Gnostic anthropology, soteriology and eschatology. They attempt to show how the Apocryphon's understanding of the central paradox of Gnostic experience, of being elect yet trapped in matter and governed by fate, has determined its selection and interpretation of anthropological, soteriological and eschatological motifs. Its reinterpretation of Genesis 1-7 forms the core of its anthropology and soteriology which agree that, although man possesses a divine spark, he requires redemption and a Revealer/Redeemer. This paradox is expressed in terms of primal, continuous and decisive revelation, represented by various divine figures. The varieties of eschatology in the Apocryphon, too, reflect not only varied traditions but also the paradox of Gnostic salvation, the "Now" and the "Not Yet".

On the question of Christianization, the thesis argues that although the central exposition (unlike the frame story) is apparently uninfluenced by Christianity, much of its material is best understood in the context of early Christian speculation about Christ based on the Old Testament and contemporary Hellenistic Judaism. While evidence of progressive Christianization or de-Christianization is scanty and mixed, there is, thirdly, some indication, not only that the Apocryphon influenced

Valentinianism, but that, in its present form, it shows signs of acquaintance with Valentinianism.

The Development of Gnostic Theology  
with special reference to the Apocryphon of John  
Irenaeus adversus haereses I 29 and 30  
and related texts

A thesis  
Submitted to  
the University of St. Andrews  
by  
Alastair Hendry Black Logan  
January 1980



Th  
9460

CERTIFICATE

I certify that Alastair Hendry Black Logan has fulfilled the conditions of the University Court 1967, No. 1, and that he is qualified to submit this thesis in application for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

St. Mary's College,  
University of St. Andrews.

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the following thesis is based on the results of research carried out by myself, that it is my own composition and that it has not previously been presented for a higher degree. The research was carried out at the University of St. Andrews under the supervision of Professor the Reverend R McL. Wilson.

## CONTENTS

|                  |   |     |
|------------------|---|-----|
| Acknowledgements |   | ii  |
| Abbreviations    |   | iii |
| Introduction     |   | 1   |
| Chapter One      | Gnostic Theogony and Cosmogony:<br>(a) The Heavenly World | 33  |
| Chapter Two      | Gnostic Theogony and Cosmogony:<br>(b) The Lower World    | 136 |
| Chapter Three    | Gnostic Anthropogony and Anthropology                     | 219 |
| Chapter Four     | Gnostic Soteriology                                       | 382 |
| Chapter Five     | Gnostic Eschatology                                       | 557 |
| Conclusion       |   | 604 |
| Bibliography     |   | 608 |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my thanks and deep gratitude first of all to my Supervisor, Professor R. McL. Wilson, for his initial help and advice, his continuing stimulus, and above all his unfailing patience through the many years and frequent vicissitudes of my research. Like the Socratic midwife and the Saviour of Valentinian Gnosticism he finally brought to birth and gave form and order to what often promised to be a shapeless abortion or hydra-headed monster. The virtues in it are his, the weaknesses my own.

Secondly I would like to thank Kathryn, my wife, who has had to share me with this thesis for so many years, but who has never complained. To her I dedicate this work with love and gratitude.



# ABBREVIATIONS

|           |   |
|-----------|---|
| AJ        | Apocryphon of John (BG 8502,2; CG II,1; CG III,1; CG IV,1)              |
| Allog     | Allogenes (CG XI,3)   |
| ApocAd    | Apocalypse of Adam (CG V,5)   |
| 1ApocJas  | First Apocalypse of James (CG V,3)                                      |
| ApocPaul  | Apocalypse of Paul (CG V,2)   |
| ApocryJas | Apocryphon of James (CG I,2)  |
| ARN       | Aboth de Rabbi Nathan   |
| BG        | Berlin Gnostic Codex (BG 8502)  |
| BiOr      | Bibliotheca Orientalis  |
| BZNW      | Beiheft zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft          |
| CC        | Corpus Christianorum  |
| CG        | Cairo Gnostic Codices, i.e. the Nag Hammadi Codices                     |
| CH        | Corpus Hermeticum   |
| CSCO      | Corpus Scriptorum Christianorum Orientalium                             |
| CSEL      | Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum                            |
| De Res    | Treatise on Resurrection (Epistle to Rheginos: CG I,4)                  |
| DialSot   | Dialogue of the Saviour (CG III,5)                                      |
| Eug       | Eugnostos the Blessed (CG III,3; V,1)                                   |
| ExSoul    | Exegesis on the Soul (CG II,6)  |
| GCS       | Die griechische christliche Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte |
| GEgypt    | Gospel of the Egyptians (CG III,2; IV,2)                                |
| GGA       | Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen  |
| GPh       | Gospel of Philip (CG II,3)  |
| GrPower   | The Concept of Our Great Power (CG VI,4)                                |
| GrSeth    | The Second Logos of the Great Seth                                      |
| GTh       | Gospel of Thomas (CG II,2)  |
| GTr       | Gospel of Truth (CG I,3)  |
| JbAC      | Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum                                     |
| JETS      | Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society                          |
| JNES      | Journal of Near Eastern Studies   |
| JTS       | Journal of Theological Studies  |
| Melch     | Melchisedek (CG IX,1)   |
| NatArch   | The Hypostasis of the Archons (CG II,4)                                 |
| NHS       | Nag Hammadi Studies   |
| NTS       | New Testament Studies   |
| On8th9th  | The Discourse on the Eighth and Ninth (CG VI, 6)                        |
| ParShem   | Paraphrase of Shem (CG VII,1)   |
| PetPhil   | The Letter of Peter to Philip (CG VIII,2)                               |
| PG        | Patrologia Graeca (ed. J.P. Migne)                                      |
| PGM       | Papyri Graecae Magicae  |
| PL        | Patrologia Latina (ed. J.P. Migne)                                      |
| PRE       | Pirke de Rabbi Eliezer  |

|           |  |
|-----------|--|
| PS        | Pistis Sophia                                    |
| IQS       | Qumran Manual of Discipline                      |
| RGG       | Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart             |
| RThPh     | Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie             |
| SJC       | Sophia of Jesus Christ (BG 8502,3; CG III,4)     |
| TestTr    | The Testimony of Truth (CG IX,3)                 |
| ThCont    | The Book of Thomas the Contender (CG II,7)       |
| ThLZ      | Theologische Literaturzeitung                    |
| ThR       | Theologische Rundschau                           |
| 3StSeth   | The Three Steles of Seth (CG VII,5)              |
| TJ 1      | Targum of Pseudo Jonathan or Jerusalem Targum    |
| TrimProt  | Trimorphic Protennoia (CG XIII,1)                |
| TriTrac   | The Tripartite Tractate (CG I,5)                 |
| TU        | Texte und Untersuchungen                         |
| Vig. Chr. | Vigiliae Christianae                             |
| Zostr     | Zostrianos (CG VIII,1)                           |
| ZRGG      | Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte |
| ZTK       | Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche             |

## INTRODUCTION

### (a) The texts and versions of the Apocryphon of John

The existence of the Apocryphon of John in a Coptic version has been known since 1896 when Dr. C. Reinhardt acquired the manuscript now known as Codex Berolinensis (BG 8502) in Cairo. Carl Schmidt drew attention to the find and briefly described the work in the same year, but thought it formed part of the first text in the Codex, the Gospel of Mary.<sup>1</sup> He corrected this mistake in a later article in which he argued that Irenaeus' account of the Barbelognostics in Adversus haereses I 29 had been drawn from a Gnostic original of which he had excerpted a part, and that that original was identical with the Apocryphon.<sup>2</sup> He further argued that the original used by Irenaeus extended beyond his excerpt, and that Irenaeus broke off where he did because his following chapter (I 30) gave a complete summary of the doctrines of a Gnostic sect which were very similar to those of ch. 29 and he wished to avoid repetition.<sup>3</sup> However he did admit that there were differences between the Coptic version and the Greek original, but he ascribed them to mistakes in the translation due to the difficulty of the material.<sup>4</sup> But Schmidt had only translated parts of the first section of the Apocryphon, the cosmogonic section which corresponded to adv. haer. I 29, and full knowledge of the text was only attained, after various vicissitudes, in 1955 with the publication by W.C. Till of the first three (Gnostic) works in the Berlin Codex (Gospel of Mary, Apocryphon of John, Sophia of Jesus Christ) with an introduction and translation in German.<sup>5</sup>

Till, however, had been able to make use of the other Coptic versions of the Apocryphon and the Sophia which had turned up among the thirteen Coptic codices discovered at Nag Hammadi in Upper Egypt in 1945/46.<sup>6</sup> They formed the first and fourth writings in Codex III, the first of the codices to be acquired by the Coptic Museum in Cairo in 1946 and therefore identified as Codex I by Doresse and Puech who had been the first to inform the scholarly world of the discovery.<sup>7</sup> By 1949 Doresse had been able to discover the existence of two other versions of the Apocryphon (CG II and IV) and he and Puech were able to give some information about them and their relation to the other versions.<sup>8</sup> Doresse considered the version in Codex II to be a more developed and visibly older recension than that in Codex III and BG and he felt it confirmed the archaic non-Christian nature of the text.<sup>9</sup>

In his edition of BG Till was able to include the variant readings in CG III and in his introduction he discussed the relation of the two versions. He found them to be very closely related and he alluded to the fact that the other two texts offered a longer version which, from an examination of photographs of part of CG II, he felt diverged very considerably from the shorter versions in BG and CG III.<sup>10</sup> Access to the longer version of the Apocryphon in CG II was made possible by the publication in 1956 by Pahor Labib of photographs of it along with other works from the same codex.<sup>11</sup> Working independently of each other A.K. Helmbold and S. Giversen prepared editions of CG II, the

first an unpublished dissertation,<sup>12</sup> the second published in 1963 and taking into account the versions in BG and CG III.<sup>13</sup>

But it was only with the publication by M. Krause and P. Labib of all three versions of the Apocryphon from the Nag Hammadi corpus in 1963 that scientific examination of the relations between the four versions could begin.<sup>14</sup> Krause described the texts in CG II and CG IV/<sup>as</sup> the longer version because it had many interpolations lacking in the shorter version (BG and CG III), and promised a further publication giving a synopsis of the variants in the four versions.<sup>15</sup>

With all the texts now available several translations followed: R. Kasser's French translation of BG, CG III and the long recension (CG II and IV) in synoptic form in 580 verses, and the English translations of BG (from the German by M. Krause) in the English version of the first volume of W. Foerster's Gnosis<sup>16</sup> and of CG II in The Nag Hammadi Library in English.<sup>17</sup> One might mention in this connection the illuminating discussion of the version in BG by Y. Janssens.<sup>18</sup> Finally the Facsimile editions of CG II, CG III and CG IV appeared in 1974, 1976 and 1975 respectively.<sup>19</sup>

(b) The unity, sources, original form and influence of the Apocryphon

Schmidt in his second article raised the questions of the original form of the Apocryphon, its date and relation to Irenaeus adv. haer. I 29, and his arguments tended to influence the earlier stages of the recent debate. He had contended that Irenaeus had had access to the

Apocryphon (or something very like it) but had only excerpted its first, cosmogonic, half. However he did allude to certain divergences between the Apocryphon and Irenaeus' account, a point not all his later critics appreciated. Doresse, however, did and drew attention to the fact that in two of the cases of divergence, which Schmidt had explained in general as errors in the Coptic or mistakes by Irenaeus, the latter's text agreed with the Gospel of the Egyptians against the Apocryphon. This suggested that Irenaeus had been faithful to his original which must have differed slightly from our Apocryphon.

Doresse ventured the tentative suggestion that this work may have formed a treatise on the higher cosmogony which Irenaeus summarised and which later was used to form the first part of the Apocryphon.<sup>20</sup>

Thus argument centred round the questions of the unity of the Apocryphon, the existence of a Grundschrift containing only the first part of the Apocryphon, and the relation of the Apocryphon to Irenaeus' account.

Doresse, on the basis of a literary analysis of the four versions, argued that the work lacked unity. Its most ancient element was the cosmogony known to Irenaeus in independent form and summarised by him, to which was added an anthropological section, itself interrupted by an interpolated soteriological passage on the destiny of souls. Lastly a description of the descent of a heavenly redeemer was added to the latest versions (i.e. CG II and CG IV) and the whole work unified by the frame story, the dialogue between the apostle John and the Saviour.

This analysis Doresse felt confirmed by the fact that Irenaeus knew in primitive form the first part of the Apocryphon and would surely have reacted strongly to any ascription of it to Jesus himself.<sup>21</sup>

W. van Unnik, pointing out the striking fact that the passages common to Irenaeus and the Apocryphon are confined to one particular section, agreed with Doresse's query/whether with Schmidt one could date the whole Apocryphon before AD 180. If Irenaeus had known the whole it was a mystery why he had not mentioned it. He too argued from the differences in style and structure between the first and second parts that the Apocryphon was not all of a piece and that Irenaeus had not excerpted from it as a whole but that both had borrowed from the same source.<sup>22</sup> W. Foerster, too, writing about the same time, could not believe that the short version presented an original form of a Gnostic system or could have served as the basis for Irenaeus' account. He pointed to contradictions and inconsistencies and to places where Irenaeus' version was more comprehensible than the Apocryphon.<sup>23</sup>

H.-M. Schenke also pointed to the differences between Irenaeus and the Apocryphon and the inconsistencies between the first and second parts of the latter. He claimed to find evidence of a clear literary suture at BG 44, 19. Thus he too rejected Schmidt's contention that Irenaeus had the complete Apocryphon before him and argued, like Doresse, that Irenaeus had excerpted a complete work on cosmogony. The second part of the Apocryphon had probably never had an independent

existence and presumably the original cosmogony had been in the form of question and answer. But despite the similarity, the source used by Irenaeus contained a variant of the cosmogony of the Apocryphon and not that cosmogony itself.<sup>24</sup> Puech, too, is concerned with the problem of the Grundschrift, but while allowing that the Apocryphon, either in one of its present forms or one more primitive was "quite certainly used by Irenaeus", he is rather more reserved about Doresse's arguments for a short treatise on the higher cosmogony identical with Irenaeus' source as that Grundschrift and as being of non-Christian character.<sup>25</sup>

On the question of the literary unity and the matter of a Grundschrift A. Kragerud, rather against the general consensus, argues that the anthropological-soteriological sections of the Apocryphon are the basic document since they form a continuous commentary on Genesis (BG 39, 1 - 75, 10), except for the passage on the souls (BG 64, 13 - 71, 2), which he thinks is an interpolation since it contains no Genesis material. The exegesis is primary, the cosmogony and frame story secondary. Kragerud would see the primary document as a tract which through the additions of the cosmogony and frame story was finally presented as an apocalypse.<sup>26</sup> Kasser would also see the kernel of the Apocryphon as a piece of Gnostic exegesis of Genesis (CG II 13, 13 - 25, 15) to which was added a dogmatic prologue of heterogeneous elements of which some are very ancient, and indeed even pre-Christian. Later



the "catechism" on the destiny of souls was added and finally the hymn at the end of the long recension. To give the whole some degree of probability for Christian readers it was completed by a fictitious historical framework.<sup>27</sup>

Böhlig too, in his review of Giversen's edition, accepts the composite nature of the Apocryphon, suggesting that it is a compilation of various traditions. CG II was not the original form but an ever more expanded compilation which was already complete in the Greek original. The consequences of this for Irenaeus' account in adv. haer. I 29 are that it need not have been taken from the Apocryphon but could have been derived from a piece of Barbelognostic teaching to which the Apocryphon goes back. Like Doresse, Böhlig draws attention to the parallels in the Gospel of the Egyptians and suggests that the introduction to the latter must be derived from the same tradition.<sup>28</sup> Wilson sums up the general consensus of these scholars that Schmidt's opinion of the relationship between Irenaeus and the Apocryphon is no longer tenable in its original form. We have the same system in both cases, but for him it remains an open question whether Irenaeus' source was an earlier version of the Apocryphon itself or another document which served as the basis for it.<sup>29</sup> But because of the tendency of the Gnostics to adapt and revise their documents noted by Schenke, Wilson feels we must reckon with the possibility that the Coptic versions of the Apocryphon stand at some remove from the document used by

Irenaeus.<sup>30</sup> He too agrees that the Apocryphon is a composite document, appealing both to Schenke's argument about a suture and to the odd switch between references to John in the third, then the first, then the third person again.<sup>31</sup>

Helmbold, utilising the Apocryphon to illustrate the subjective nature of literary criticism with particular reference to the Bible, sets the arguments of Schenke and Doresse about the cosmogony as the Grundschrift against those of Kragerud and Kasser who would see the anthropological and soteriological sections as primary. He himself appears to reject such attempts to dissect the work. On the question of the relation of the Apocryphon to Irenaeus' account he discusses the opinions of Schmidt, Schenke and Doresse, rejecting Doresse's suggestion that the Gospel of the Egyptians was Irenaeus' source. Careful study of the pertinent passages in the Gospel of the Egyptians reveals variants between it and Irenaeus. Study of the versions of the Apocryphon and the latter's account shows that he used a version of the Apocryphon which sometimes is closer to BG and sometimes to CG II and sometimes to neither. This would indicate that his text was independent of and probably earlier than the extant versions.<sup>32</sup>

Schottroff, while accepting that Irenaeus excerpted a text which was closely related to our Apocryphon, rejected not only Schmidt's view but Schenke's argument about a suture in the Apocryphon where the parallel in Irenaeus ends. Schenke had appealed to inconsistencies

between the two parts but she noted that there were also inconsistencies within each part: they result from the combination of disparate material and do not prove a literary join.<sup>33</sup> She opened up a new and very valuable line of approach by investigating the theological conception and tendency of the various versions, including that of Irenaeus. The theological conception of the text used by Irenaeus must be seen as completely different from that of the later versions. Thus the variants in his version should not be seen as distortions on his part, since variations similar to those between the Apocryphon and adv. haer. I 29 occur between the versions of the former. Her conclusion is that none of the known versions of the Apocryphon presents a text which Irenaeus read directly in the Greek original.<sup>34</sup> But she does suggest, if indirectly, that what Irenaeus knew was a first compilation of the Apocryphon, although that is not to be identified with the present form of the work.<sup>35</sup>

Krause, in the introduction to his translation of the BG version, divides the Apocryphon into two parts, a report of a vision and a dialogue, the literary seam being found, as with Schenke, at BG 44,19. The second part appears to have been formed from two different elements; a paraphrase of Gen. 1 - 7 which has been transformed into a dialogue by the addition of three questions which can be removed without affecting the text or the sense, and a teaching on the soul which seems to have been originally formulated as a dialogue.<sup>36</sup> He then proceeds to give

a detailed analysis of the differences between the latter part of the first half of the Apocryphon (BG 26,6 - 44,19) and the parallel in Irenaeus, concluding that Irenaeus had at his disposal a source which, while not identical with the Apocryphon passage, was nevertheless similar to it. The ensuing dialogue section, which Irenaeus does not mention, was probably not contained in his source either.<sup>37</sup>

Finally on the question of Irenaeus' source and its relation to the Apocryphon there are the articles of F. Wisse<sup>38</sup> and P. Perkins.<sup>39</sup> The former raises the new problems over the reliability of the heresiological accounts of Gnostic sects posed by the discovery of the Nag Hammadi Library. He notes first of all the lack of significant overlapping in material and detail, itemising only five cases of clear agreement. The first of these is that between the Apocryphon and Irenaeus' account of the Barbelognostics which still remains the clearest and most extensive instance of common material.<sup>40</sup> In his analysis of the sources of Irenaeus' heresiological catalogue Wisse is led to conclude that Irenaeus only got his Valentinian and Marcosian material first-hand: his chapters on the Barbelognostics and Ophites came from a previous heresiological source, which, however, did incorporate some genuine Gnostic excerpts.<sup>41</sup> But his argument depends, in the case of adv. haer. I 29, on his assumption that Irenaeus' account is based in its entirety on the Apocryphon and if Irenaeus was responsible for this chapter he asks why he did not mention the latter work.<sup>42</sup> Thus he concludes

that the section on the Barbelognostics is based on some early form of the Apocryphon.<sup>43</sup> He also finds that although Nag Hammadi does not provide a close parallel to adv. haer. I 30 as in the case of I 29, many of its details are corroborated by such tractates as the Hypostasis of the Archons, the Apocryphon, the Gospel of the Egyptians and other related works. Thus it must be based on early traditions underlying these tractates.<sup>44</sup>

Perkins, taking up the question of Irenaeus' reliability, argues that the Apocryphon, being such a popular text, could have circulated in yet another form, that used by Irenaeus.<sup>45</sup> Examination of the genre and composition of adv. haer. I leads her to reject Wisse's thesis that I 29 and 30 (along with other passages) belonged to Irenaeus' heresiological source rather than having been derived from authentic documents or first hand from Gnostics themselves.<sup>46</sup> Perkins convincingly demonstrates that Irenaeus conceived his work along rhetorical lines which sought to demonstrate the immorality and inconsistency and disunity of the opposing group, and to parody their ideas.<sup>47</sup> Irenaeus' further rhetorical obligation, to attack the authorities to whom the Gnostics appeal, was discharged by making use of a genealogy of Gnostic sects deriving them all from Simon Magus and suggesting their unanimity of false doctrine and immoral behaviour. But chapters 29 following do not fit this framework: they differ in the style and method of treating heresies and do not follow the set pattern of their predecessors. But they do fit very well into the style of detailed summary which Irenaeus

uses in describing his Valentinian and Marcosian opponents earlier in the book.<sup>48</sup> Perkins suggests that one can as well assume that the Gnostic sources used for chapters 29 and 30 were current among the Valentinians, and that among his Gnostic "commentaries" Irenaeus found at least two works which the Valentinians read as sources of their own theology.<sup>49</sup>

A fundamental question which we will therefore have to examine is the unity of the Apocryphon and its precise relation to adv. haer. I 29 (and I 30). But before we can do that we must consider a second question which has tended to dominate later stages of the present debate ever since the publication of the three Nag Hammadi versions of the Apocryphon, namely which of the four versions is the most original and which of the two recensions, the long (CG II and CG IV) or the short (BG and CG III) is the older. For as Wilson has pointed out, we cannot examine the relationship between them and Irenaeus until we determine which recension is older and what their relationship is to one another.<sup>50</sup>

Already in 1949 on the basis of a brief examination of the versions in CG II and CG IV Doresse was of the opinion that the text in CG II represented a more developed and visibly older recension than that in BG and CG III,<sup>51</sup> although in his later book he speaks of CG II and IV as the latest versions, and admits that it is difficult to be sure whether the triple descent of the redeemer existed before in relatively ancient

versions of the Apocryphon.<sup>52</sup> But his cautious suggestion that the confused lines present at this point in BG and CG III may possibly represent a tradition deriving from a copyist's omissions and errors shows that he still prefers to consider the long recension more original.<sup>53</sup> Schenke, however, felt that the long forms appeared to have undergone secondary expansion,<sup>54</sup> and Puech too doubted Doresse's original contention, but drew attention to the complexity of the problem. Besides certain "visibly" later additions in CG II (particularly 15, 29 - 19, 10) the long version might contain portions of the primitive text.<sup>55</sup> If the short version were held to be the older it could not readily be identified with the original version because of frequent anomalies and inconsistencies.<sup>56</sup>

Krause in the introduction to his edition of the three versions from Nag Hammadi also saw the problem as not simply a matter of which version was more original, the longer or the shorter. Was it not more elaborate so that some parts of the one version might be older than those of the other and vice versa?<sup>57</sup> His proposed treatment of these problems in another work must refer to his unpublished Münster thesis of 1965, Literarkritische Untersuchung des Apokryphon des Johannes which he refers to in a footnote to his article in the Messina Congress volume.<sup>58</sup> His conclusions were that the long recension originated from the short through insertions and that the former attempts to eliminate contradictions in the latter. As with Schottroff he further felt that the inconsistencies in the short were the consequence of its



being composed of various parts.<sup>59</sup>

As Krause notes, his conclusions run directly counter to those of Giversen in his commentary. Giversen, although unfortunately he did not have access to the version of the Apocryphon in CG IV as Krause did, gives a detailed analysis of the relationships between CG II, CG III and BG in his commentary. He concludes that, although CG II has a certain amount of "specific material" (e.g. 15, 29-19, 10), what is important is the common tradition.<sup>60</sup> He finds that the version in CG II represents a more original form in terms of comprehensiveness as compared to the other two versions, and that BG and CG III must represent abridged versions.<sup>61</sup> While admitting that these abridgements are primarily editorial Giversen also seems to weaken his case by going on to allow that CG II does contain insertions, some quite long.<sup>62</sup> The latter also betrays a certain spiritualizing tendency and thus Giversen's final judgement is that while as regards comprehensiveness CG II's version is more original, as regards content it has undergone revision.<sup>63</sup> But it is the version which is closest to the excerpt of Irenaeus.<sup>64</sup> None of the texts, however, can be regarded as the original version and the result, as Giversen admits, is that one has to examine the merits of each passage in each version.<sup>65</sup>

Kasser attempts a different approach to the problem of the relationship and originality of the versions and recensions by means of an analysis of the Greek loan words in each text, making use of the evidence



derived from study of the Coptic translations of the Bible. The old Coptic versions are characterized by a greater irregularity in the use of Greek loan words rather than by an abundance or scarcity of them, whereas the classic later versions have a higher absolute proportion of them. There is an a priori probability, argues Kasser, that the Coptic Gnostic versions followed a similar course.<sup>66</sup> From a statistical analysis of 330 units of comparison and 160 individual Greek loan words he concludes that the short recension could be prior to the long in 35 per cent of cases. CG III and the long recension (L) represent better quality manuscripts but paradoxically CG III, the most recent version, most often represents what was probably the original textual form.<sup>67</sup> This result, however, does not prove the earlier date of the short recension: both forms could have coexisted in Greek before having been translated.<sup>68</sup> Against Giversen Kasser argues that in antiquity sacred texts were far more likely to be lengthened rather than abbreviated and that for this reason the short recension must be the earlier.<sup>69</sup> He points to a number of evident expansions in the long recension (CG II, 11, 21 - 13, 10 with its glosses; 15, 29 - 19, 10 from the Book of Zoroaster; 28, 11 - 32 elaboration; 30, 11 - 31, 28 a hymn).<sup>70</sup> But he avers that in any case the short recension is far removed from the original state of the work.<sup>71</sup> He concludes by arguing that the first Coptic version may have been oral and not written but later copied by a stenographer. This would give a better explanation of the linguistic

and stylistic irregularities. The Gnostic textual tradition, in any case, was less rigorous than that of contemporary Christians with their bible.<sup>72</sup>

Helmbold, in a review article of Giversen's edition of CG II, agrees with Giversen's arguments about the priority of the long recension and he finds further support for Giversen's thesis in the fact that the names of the angels in the long passage in CG II (15, 29 - 19, 10) do not contain any Coptic letters borrowed from Demotic. Most of these names are distinctly Greek, which suggests to Helmbold that the longer version existed already in a Greek original.<sup>73</sup> In his later article already cited he argues on the question of the purest text that Kasser's appeal to the use of Greek words versus Coptic is inconclusive, partly because it is impossible to determine how many times a given text has been copied in either Greek or Coptic. He feels that it seems impossible at the present to reach a definite conclusion as to which text is purest.<sup>74</sup>

K. Rudolph, in his very useful survey of literature on the Apocryphon and the problems of its unity, original form and the relationship between the versions, thinks that the long recension has to be reckoned as the more recent and that the Apocryphon must have undergone a complicated process of development. He cites with approval Böhlig's view in his review of Giversen that the version in CG II is not an original form but a more and more expanded compilation which had already been

completed in the Greek version.<sup>75</sup> Schottroff, too, while seeing the shorter versions (BG and CG III) as older in terms of Traditions-geschichte, asserts that they are not identical with the original version. She sees the inserts in CG II (30, 11ff.) as clearly secondary because they have not been amalgamated into the text.<sup>76</sup> On this question too, although there appears to be general agreement that both recensions are far from the original text, opinion is evenly divided between those who favour the priority of the long recension (Doresse, Puech, Giversen, Helmbold) and those who see the short as more original (Schenke, Kasser, Krause, Rudolph, Schottroff<sup>77</sup>).

A third question, which Doresse also raised early on, was the issue of Christianization. Does the Apocryphon represent a Christianization of a non-Christian original as Doresse had ventured to suggest?<sup>78</sup> Puech wished to reserve his opinion on this claim<sup>79</sup> which Doresse later repeated in his book, classifying the Apocryphon with the Sophia of Jesus Christ as originally purely Gnostic works later disguised as Christian books.<sup>80</sup> Krause agrees with this classification of the Apocryphon. He finds this process of Christianization confirmed by the striking fact that Christian material always comes second in the process of identification whereby various characters from the various parts are equated with one another. In such a process, the first-named must represent the original. Thus for example the Light is equated with Christ.<sup>81</sup>

As regards the figure of the Saviour, van Unnik pointed out that the role of Jesus Christ was evidently no more than a mediator of the true knowledge which was the real saving power. The figure of Jesus could come right out of the book without changing its character in any essential respect.<sup>82</sup> He does admit that the author of our present Apocryphon knew his New Testament intimately, but he points out that references to New Testament texts are woven into an entirely different context of thought from their original matrix.<sup>83</sup> Everything points to the Apocryphon having originated outside Christianity and to the enrichment of an existing system at a later stage with Christian material.<sup>84</sup> Van Unnik based his observations on BG but Giversen, commenting on the revelation discourse by the Saviour at the end of CG II, notes in similar fashion that it is conspicuous that the redeemer is nowhere referred to as Christ or Jesus or Saviour or Lord.<sup>85</sup> Similarly Kasser finds elements in the dogmatic prologue which date back to the time when Gnosticism was not in contact with Christianity.<sup>86</sup>

Wilson is led by the composite structure of the work and the secondary nature of the narrative framework to look for clear and unmistakeable Christian elements such as New Testament quotations or allusions.<sup>87</sup> He stresses the fact that the Apocryphon in its present form is a Christian Gnostic document but wonders whether these New Testament elements are not signs of Christianization. He points to the striking contrast between the comparatively spasmodic occurrence of

these allusions and the thorough-going reinterpretation of the Genesis creation story in the main body of the work.<sup>88</sup> Other details such as the name "Christ", the play on  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  /  $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  , the ambiguity over "Christ" ( $\overline{XC}$ ) and "Lord" ( $\overline{XC}$ ) support the view that the Apocryphon represents a Christianization of an older non-Christian text. But Wilson is led to ask if this is in fact confirmed by comparison of the versions, and if there is not perhaps evidence of de-Christianization.<sup>89</sup>

Schottroff again presents a new perspective by asserting that the Apocryphon definitely originated in the post-Christian period but not as a result of Christian influence.<sup>90</sup> There is no sign in it of the vital Christian Gnostic problem, how to unite the birth and death of Christ with the heavenly redeemer. The Christian characteristics, which are meagre, are found in the narrative framework which was probably added at a later stage. She concludes that the author had no direct knowledge of the New Testament or of Christian proclamation and that in the light of this it is not possible to see the Apocryphon as a product of Christian Gnosis. Christ's name was only added to give the work a certain authority.

Wisse and Perkins only deal with this question in passing: Wisse suggests that Gnostic holy books normally did not include crude identification with Christian doctrines and were therefore only marginally Christian (this would appear to include the Apocryphon).<sup>91</sup> In his

conclusion he isolates a non-Christian Gnosticism deriving from Judaism and developing in parallel with a gnosticizing strain in the Christian Church. When the more extreme Gnostics were expelled from the Church they took over non-Christian mythologumena and claimed they represented the true interpretation of Scripture.<sup>92</sup> Presumably the Apocryphon would be an example of this in Wisse's eyes. Perkins suggests that if the source Irenaeus used was indeed a non-Christian Gnostic work similar to the one used by the Apocryphon, on her premiss that it and the source underlying adv. haer. I 30 were among the sources of Valentinian theology, then we may see the mythologumena of I 29 reinterpreted in two Christian-Gnostic contexts; that represented by the several versions of the Apocryphon and that, considerably elaborated, represented by the followers of Ptolemaeus.<sup>93</sup>

This last point brings us to the final question: what, if any, is the relationship of the Apocryphon to Valentinianism. Irenaeus had asserted that the school of Valentinus with its many rival opinions (he compares it with the Hydra) had originated from the kinds of views he had summarised in adv. haer. I 29 (Barbelognostics) and I 30 (Ophites).<sup>94</sup> Already in 1947 F.-M.-M. Sagnard had accepted Schmidt's identification of the Apocryphon as the source of Irenaeus' account in adv. haer. I 29 and presented it as a source of Valentinian theology.<sup>95</sup> G. Quispel, too, had asserted, even before the discoveries at Nag Hammadi, that behind Valentinus there lay the tradition of popular Egyptian Gnosis. He

appealed to the evidence of Irenaeus who, he accepted, had excerpted the Apocryphon, and to the existing documentary evidence when carefully examined. According to him Valentinus (and Basilides) had Hellenized and Christianized the already existing popular Egyptian Gnosis.<sup>96</sup>

Quispel has since modified his view that the Apocryphon itself was Irenaeus' source, but has held fast to the rest of his thesis.<sup>97</sup>

Jonas is more cautious than Quispel and is content to state that the Barbelognostics (his term is "Barbeliotes") of Irenaeus adv. haer. I 29, whose views he sees as found in the Apocryphon, represent the closest approximation to the Valentinian form.<sup>98</sup> That proximity he sees in their both having a developed doctrine of the Pleroma and using the concept of emanation in pairs for the progressive production of that Pleroma out of the divine unity.<sup>99</sup> The Apocryphon, however, is on a more primitive intellectual level than the Valentinian system and lacks those profundities of conception which for Jonas constitute "the unique originality of Valentinian thought".<sup>100</sup> He therefore regards the Apocryphon, in a way similar to Quispel, as more nearly an expression of the common thought of the Syrian-Egyptian or Sophia-gnosis at large.<sup>101</sup>

Wilson notes the possible significance of the Apocryphon for the development of Valentinianism, alluding to Irenaeus' evidence. He asks whether it is possible to trace a line of development from the supposedly early Gospel of Truth to the full Valentinian system such as to show that knowledge of Barbelognostic theory in general, and the



Apocryphon of John in particular, has contributed to the process. If one removes the Barbelognostic elements, how much of the Valentinian theory remains?<sup>102</sup> Wilson thus points up the problems. Of other recent treatments of the question of a relationship with Valentinianism besides the suggestion of Perkins presented above, we might note Schottroff's view that the Apocryphon is not the product of a Valentinian school, since it bears no traces of the interpretation of myths characteristic of Valentinianism.<sup>103</sup> On the question of the truth of Irenaeus' contention that the Valentinians derive from the Gnostics of adv. haer. I 30 Schottroff says we can only accept Irenaeus' view or leave the matter open.<sup>104</sup>

With the publication of all the codices in the Facsimile Edition and an English translation of the entire library including the works in BG, we are at last in a position to give a more definitive answer to these questions about the unity of the Apocryphon and its precise relation to adv. haer. I 29 and 30, the priority of the texts, the question of Christianization or de-Christianization and the relationship with Valentinianism. This is all the more possible because other texts from Nag Hammadi with cosmogonical details similar to those of the Apocryphon, the Gospel of the Egyptians and adv. haer. I 29 have become accessible (e.g. the Trimorphic Protennoia from Codex XIII and Zostrianos from Codex VIII). These can perhaps cast more light on the relationship of the various accounts and the development of the



motifs. Other versions of Valentinianism have also become available (e.g. the Tripartite Tractate from Codex I, the Jung Codex, and the untitled Valentinian tractate in Codex XI) which can help us in an attempt to determine whether texts like the Apocryphon did indeed influence the development of Valentinianism.

Helmbold has drawn attention to the inconclusive and indeed contradictory results arrived at by means of literary analysis, although he notes that most scholars see three main subjects discussed within the revelational frame story, namely cosmogony (covering the description of the supreme being, the world of light, the fall of Sophia and the creation of this world by her offspring Ialdabaoth, which leads to her repentance), anthropology (which includes the creation of man and the contest between Light and Darkness for control of him) and soteriology (which includes the dialogue on the destiny of souls and the hymn of the Redeemer celebrating her (his) descent into the netherworld of darkness, the latter being present only in the long recension).<sup>105</sup> Although we might disagree over the division between the anthropological and soteriological sections and include the struggle over man in the latter, we accept the basic analysis.

In fact this doctrinal or theological analysis, as Schottroff has suggested, may offer a way out of the apparent literary-critical impasse over the unity and original form of the Apocryphon. Schottroff has demonstrated the importance of trying to discover the theological

tendency or tendencies behind a particular text or version. Such an approach may well help us to understand just why a particular version differs from another in the content, order of events, interpretation of events etc. It may also help us to trace the development of those lines of Gnostic tradition which are represented in the Apocryphon of John, Irenaeus adv. haer. I 29 and 30 and related works from Nag Hammadi like the Gospel of the Egyptians, the Trimorphic Protennoia, the Hypostasis of the Archons and the Untitled Treatise from Codex II.

Thus in order to find answers to the questions about the original text of the Apocryphon and its relation to adv. haer. I 29 and other related documents, about the problem of whether it represents a Christianization of a non- and even pre-Christian original or whether the versions attest a process of de-Christianization, and about the precise relationship between <sup>the</sup> Apocryphon and Valentinianism, our procedure will be to examine these questions within the framework of the major theological and doctrinal divisions of the Apocryphon. We shall enquire whether the basic theological stance and purpose behind each text and the various theological tendencies present in the several versions of a text like the Apocryphon may not help to explain the differences between kindred works and systems. Apart from Giversen's commentary and Schottroff's discussion this area has been largely overlooked.

We therefore propose to examine the theogony and cosmogony of the Apocryphon in chapters one and two, devoting chapter one to the

description of the heavenly world with particular reference to the parallels in Irenaeus' adv. haer. I 29 (but also I 30), and chapter two to the fall of Sophia, the origin of the Demiurge, Ialdabaoth and the creation of the visible universe, again with particular reference to the parallels in adv. haer. I 29 and kindred texts. Chapter three will deal with the anthropology of the Apocryphon, chapter four with its soteriology (including the question of Christology), and chapter five with its eschatology, all with particular reference to adv. haer. I 30 and kindred texts and systems.

Notes to Introduction

1. "Ein vorirenäisches gnostisches Originalwerk in koptischen Sprache", Sitzungsberichte der kgl. preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin, 1896, pp. 839-47.  
See on this Henri-Charles Puech, "The Apocryphon of John" in E. Hennecke - W. Schneemelcher, New Testament Apocrypha, I, London 1963, pp. 314 ff.
2. "Irenäus und seine Quelle in adv. haer. I.29", in Philotesia. Paul Kleinert zum 70 Geburtstag dargebracht, Berlin 1907, pp. 317 - 336, esp. pp. 317ff.
3. Ibid., pp. 333 - 5.
4. Ibid., p. 335.
5. Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502 (TU 60, V Reihe, Band 5, Berlin 1955). English translations of this text can be found in Gnosticism: An Anthology (ed. R.M. Grant) London, 1961, pp. 69ff.; Gnosis: A Selection of Gnostic Texts (ed. W. Foerster; Eng. trans. ed. R. McL. Wilson) Vol I, Oxford 1972, pp. 105ff.
6. On the find see e.g. J. Doresse, The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics (trans. P. Mairé), London 1960, ch. III, pp. 116ff.; The Jung Codex: A Newly Recovered Gnostic Papyrus (trans. and ed. F.L. Cross) London 1955, pp. 13ff., 40ff.; J. Dart, The Laughing Savior, New York 1976; the Introduction by J.M. Robinson to The Nag Hammadi Library in English: Translated by Members of the Coptic Gnostic Library Project of the Institute for Antiquity and Christianity, Leiden 1977, pp. 10 - 25.
7. H.-C. Puech, J. Doresse; "Nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Égypte", Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 1948, pp. 87 - 95; Togo Mina, "Le papyrus gnostique du Musée Copte", Vig. Chr. 2 (1948), pp. 129 - 36. See W.C. Till, op.cit., pp. 8f.; H.-C. Puech in Hennecke - Schneemelcher, I, pp. 315 ff.; M. Krause - P. Labib, Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu alt-Kairo (Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo (= ADAIK), Koptische Reihe, Band 1), Wiesbaden 1962 (3), pp. 5ff. The numbering of the codices now universally adopted is that of Krause. On this see J.M. Robinson, "The Coptic Gnostic Library Today", NTS 14 (1967/68) pp. 380ff.; D.M. Scholer, Nag Hammadi Bibliography 1948-1969, Leiden 1971, and the Supplementa in Novum Testamentum 13-17, 19f.

8. J. Doresse, "Nouveaux textes gnostiques coptes découverts en Haut-Égypte: La bibliothèque de Chenoboskion", Vig. Chr. 3 (1949), pp. 133f., 136; H.-C. Puech, "Les nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Haut-Égypte", in Coptic Studies in Honor of W.E. Crum (Bulletin of the Byzantine Institute 2), Boston 1950, pp.104, 107. See also Puech in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, I, p.316.
9. Art.cit., pp.133f.
10. Op.cit., pp.10f., 34.
11. Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo, vol. I, Cairo 1956, plates 47 - 80.
12. "The Apocryphon of John. A Text Edition, Translation, and Biblical and Religious Commentary." Ph.D. dissertation, Dropsie College, 1961.
13. Apocryphon Johannis: The Coptic Text of the Apocryphon Johannis in the Nag Hammadi Codex II with Translation, Introduction and Commentary (Acta Theologica Danica Vol. V), Copenhagen 1963.
14. Op.cit. Although dated 1962 the work only appeared in 1963.
15. Ibid., pp. 3f., cf. p. 37.
16. See n. 5. The English translation, which is not simply from the German but done with the original at hand, is by R.McL. Wilson.
17. See n. 6. The translation, which makes use of CG IV where CG II is defective, is on pp. 99-116 and is by F. Wisse.
18. "L'Apocryphon de Jean", Muséon 83 (1970), pp. 157-65; 84 (1971), pp. 43-64; 403-432.
19. The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices, Leiden, Brill.
20. "Trois livres gnostiques ....", Vig. Chr. 2 (1948), pp. 157f.
21. Secret Books, pp. 210f., cf. pp. 207f.
22. Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings (Studies in Biblical Theology No. 30), London 1960, pp. 71f., (The original Dutch version dates from 1958).

23. "Das Apocryphon des Johannes" in Gott und die Götter: Festgabe für Erich Fascher zum 60. Geburtstag, Berlin 1958, pp.134-41, esp.141.
24. "Nag Hamadi Studien I : Das Literarische Problem des Apokryphon Johannis", ZRGG 14(1962), pp.57-63.
25. Hennecke-Schneemelcher, I, p.330.
26. "Apocryphon Johannis: En formanalyse", Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift 66 (1965), pp.15-38.
27. "Bibliothèque gnostique I: Le Livre Secret de Jean = Apokryphon Iōannou", RThPh 14(1964) p.146; "Le 'Livre secret de Jean' dans ses différentes formes textuelles coptes", Muséon 77 (1964)p.16.
28. A. Böhlig in BiOr 24 (1967), pp.175-7.
29. Gnosis and the New Testament, Oxford 1968, pp.104f.
30. Ibid., p.105.
31. Ibid. But note that on p.108 Wilson finds the existence of Schenke's suture "open to question".
32. "The Apocryphon of John: A Case Study in Literary Criticism", Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society, 13 (1970) pp.175f., 178.
33. Der Glaubende und die feindliche Welt (WMANT 37), Neukirchen 1970, pp.5f.
34. Ibid., p.6.
35. Ibid., pp.6f.
36. Gnosis vol.I, pp.100f.
37. Ibid., pp.101-103.
38. "The Nag Hammadi Library and the Heresiologists", Vig.Chr. 25 (1971) pp.205-223.
39. "Ireneus and the Gnostics: Rhetoric and Composition in Adversus Haereses Book One", Vig.Chr. 30 (1976), pp.193-200.

40. Art.cit., pp.207f.
41. Ibid., pp.202-17.
42. Ibid., p.215.
43. Ibid., p.217.
44. Ibid., p.218.
45. Art.cit., p.193.
46. Ibid., p.194.
47. Ibid., pp.194-7.
48. Ibid., pp.197-99.
49. Ibid., pp.199f.
50. Gnosis, p.104.
51. "Nouveaux textes gnostiques ....", Vig.Chr.3 (1949),pp.133f.
52. Secret Books, p.211.
53. Ibid.
54. "Nag Hamadi Studien I", p.57 n.1.
55. Hennecke-Schneemelcher, I, pp.328f. Puech appears to be referring to the triple descent of the redeemer. Cf. p.327.
56. Ibid., p.330.
57. Die drei Versionen, p.37.
58. Ibid.; "Der Stand der Veröffentlichung der Nag Hammadi-Texte", in Le Origini dello Gnosticismo (Supplements to Numen XII), Leiden, 1967,p.61 n.8.
59. Art.cit., p.61 n.8.
60. Apocryphon, p.276.
61. Ibid., p.277.
62. Ibid., p.279.

63. Ibid., p.281.
64. Ibid., p.282.
65. Ibid., p.277.
66. R.Kasser, "Le 'Livre Secret de Jean' dans ses différentes formes textuelles coptes", Muséon 77(1964), pp.6f.
67. Ibid., pp.14f. But cf. "Bibliothèque gnostique I: Le Livre Secret de Jean = Apokryphon Iōannou", RThPh 14 (1964), p.144, where he argues that BG is nearest the original.
68. Ibid., p.15.
69. Ibid.; "Bibliothèque gnostique I", pp.144f.
70. "Bibliothèque gnostique I", pp.144f. cf. "Le 'Livre secret de Jean'", p.15.
71. "Le 'Livre secret de Jean'", p.15.
72. "Bibliothèque gnostique I", pp.148f.
73. "The Apocryphon of John", JNES 25 (1966), pp.270f. He also cites Puech as supporting the priority of CG II in Coptic Studies, p.104.
74. "The Apocryphon of John: A Case Study in Literary Criticism", JETS 13 (1970), pp.178f.
75. "Gnosis und Gnostizismus, eine Forschungsbericht", ThR 34 (1969), p.146.
76. Der Glaubende, p.7.
77. Cf. also the views of H. Jonas in "The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics", Journal of Religion 42 (1962), p.265.
78. Vig.Chr. 3 (1949) pp.133f. Cf. G.Quispel, Gnosis als Weltreligion, 2 Aufl., Zürich 1972, pp.20f. On the question of non-Christian Gnosticism see J.M. Robinson, "The Coptic Gnostic Library Today", NTS 14 (1967/68), pp.372-80.
79. Hennecke - Schneemelcher, I, p.330.
80. Secret Books, pp.200f.



81. "Der Stand", pp.74f.
82. Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings, pp.76f.
83. Ibid., p.77.
84. Ibid., p.79.
85. Apocryphon, p.270.
86. RThPh 14 (1964), p.146 n.1.
87. Gnosis, pp.105-7. Cf. The Gnostic Problem, London 1958, p.154, where Wilson surmises, on the basis of the lack of strictly Christian elements over against the centrality of the Genesis reinterpretation, that the work may represent pre-Christian Jewish Gnosticism.
88. Ibid., p.107.
89. Ibid., pp.107f., 109.
90. Der Glaubende, p.7.
91. "The Nag Hammadi Library", p.216.
92. Ibid., pp.222f.
93. "Ireneus and the Gnostics", p.200.
94. Adv.haer. I 30,14 (Harvey I 241: Tales quidem secundum eos sententiae sunt: a quibus, velut Lernaea hydra, multiplex capitibus fera de Valentini schola generata est. Cf. I 31,3 (Harvey I 243); II praef. 1 (Harvey I 249). Tertullian, who is almost entirely dependent on Irenaeus for his description of the Valentinian system, appears to contradict Irenaeus' judgement when he says (adv. Val. 39: A. Kroymann CSEL 47.212.5f.) that the doctrines of the Valentinians growing up in this way (ita inolescentes) have now matured into the forests of the Gnostics (in silvas iam exoleverunt Gnosticorum). However, this contradiction is more apparent than real because the metaphor surely is of shoots of apparent Christian origin actually growing up among existing Gnostic forests and thus revealing their true nature and origin.
95. La gnose valentinienne et le témoignage de S.Irénée, Paris 1947, pp.445f.

96. Gnosis als Weltreligion 2 Aufl., p.30. Cf. "The Original Doctrine of Valentine", Vig. Chr. 1 (1947), p.47 (= Gnostic Studies I, Istanbul 1974, p.30); "La conception de l'homme dans la gnose valentinienne", Gnostic Studies I, pp. 46f.; "From Mythos to Logos" *ibid.*, p.164; "Gnosticism and the New Testament", *ibid.*, pp.295f.; "Origen and the Valentinian Gnosis", Vig. Chr. 28 (1974), p.33.
97. Cf. e.g. Vig. Chr. 28 (1974), p.33.
98. The Gnostic Religion Boston 1963, p.177.
99. *Ibid.*
100. *Ibid.*, p.199.
101. *Ibid.*
102. Gnosis, pp.110f, cf. The Gnostic Problem, London 1958, pp.154f., where Wilson asks whether the evident links of the Apocryphon with Valentinianism indicate that it influenced Valentinianism or vice versa.
103. Der Glaubende, p.7.
104. *Ibid.*, p.69.
105. "The Apocryphon of John", JETS 13 (1970), p.174.

## CHAPTER ONE

Gnostic Theogony and Cosmogony: (a) The Heavenly World

The Apocryphon begins with a frame story<sup>1</sup> which sets the scene and establishes the Christian character of the work in its present form.<sup>2</sup> John the brother of James and son of Zebedee (he appears at this point in the third person) encounters a Pharisee named Arimanios as he is going up to the Temple who asks him where his master is. John replies that he has returned to where he originally came from. The Pharisee then claims that this (or the) Nazorean (i.e. Nazarene) led them astray, closed their hearts, and diverted them from the traditions of their ancestors.<sup>3</sup> As Giversen has suggested, the Pharisee is given the symbolical name of the evil spirit of Zoroastrianism in its Greek form.<sup>4</sup> His slanders will be refuted by the appearance of the Saviour to John and his revelation of the truth. Further, it will appear at the conclusion of the exposition that it was not the Saviour who led men astray and closed their hearts till the present, but the counterfeit spirit, the creation of the evil Demiurge Ialdabaoth and his archons.<sup>5</sup> The frame story thus fits neatly into the main narrative.

John in great grief is led to ask how the Saviour was chosen and why he was sent into the world, who his Father was who sent him, and what the nature of the aeon is to which the elect will go. The

Saviour had said that the present aeon had assumed the form of the imperishable aeon but had not given any information about the latter.<sup>6</sup> This suggests that any ensuing revelation will have to deal with the nature of God (theology) and the heavenly aeon (cosmology), the nature of the Saviour and his work (soteriology), and the final goal of our salvation (eschatology). And in fact when the Revealer does appear in the manner characteristic of the apocryphal Acts of the Apostles or the Pistis Sophia,<sup>7</sup> he identifies himself as the one who is with them for all time (cf. Matt. 28:20), the Father the Mother and the Son, the eternally existent and pure, who will make known to John what exists, what has come into being and what is to be (cf. Rev. 1:19).<sup>8</sup> He has also come to teach John about the perfect Man, and John is bidden to pass on this teaching to his fellow spirits of the immoveable race of the perfect Man.<sup>9</sup> Now the concepts of the perfect Man and his race occur in the main body of the Apocryphon; the perfect Man is the heavenly Adamas<sup>10</sup> and his "immoveable race" appears to designate the Gnostics themselves.<sup>11</sup>

Further, the description of the Revealer as appearing in three forms<sup>12</sup> and his self-predication recall both the triple descending Revealer/Redeemer of the revelation discourse or hymn at the end of the long recension (and the allied figure, the Protennoia of the Trimorphic Protennoia<sup>13</sup>), and the figure of Barbelo herself in the cosmogony of the Apocryphon.<sup>14</sup> This suggests that there are indeed

links, if not always explicit ones, between the frame story and the main narrative, including the revelation discourse at the end of the long recension. Whether the version of the Apocryphon known to Irenaeus, or at least the source or tradition which both the Apocryphon and Irenaeus or his authority have drawn upon, contained this opening frame story cannot be given a positive answer. Certainly if the teaching Irenaeus outlines had been put into the mouth of Christ, one might have expected some indication of this on his part, as Doresse has argued.<sup>15</sup> Presumably, if, as Perkins has plausibly suggested, Irenaeus found the document he has summarised in chapter 29 among the Valentinian "commentaries",<sup>16</sup> he considered it a Christian work used by Christian heretics, although his account contains almost no trace of Christian influence apart from the name "Christ" given to the Light, the son of Barbelo.<sup>17</sup>

#### The Supreme Being

The description of the theogony and higher cosmogony of the Apocryphon now commences with the statement that the Monad is a monarchy to which nothing is superior.<sup>18</sup> There then follows a description of the supreme being which is a classic exposition of negative, apophatic theology.<sup>19</sup> However, he is given certain positive titles particularly at the outset. Thus he is the Father of the All, the holy invisible Spirit,<sup>20</sup> the Light.<sup>21</sup> The passage in the middle, which describes the supreme being by the via eminentiae as far superior to

perfection, blessedness and divinity<sup>22</sup> has an almost word-for-word parallel in the Allogenes from Codex XI (CG XI,3).<sup>23</sup> This might suggest that both works are using a common piece of tradition in their descriptions of the supreme being and that therefore these descriptions are themselves compilations. Certainly Irenaeus' depiction of the supreme being <sup>the</sup>in/systems described in adv.haer. I 29 and I 30 is extremely brief and gives very little indication that his sources contained a long description of the highest deity in negative terms. However, it should be noted that in I 29 he speaks of a certain nameless Father, who is subsequently described as the great Light,<sup>24</sup> both of which ideas occur in the Apocryphon,<sup>25</sup> and in I 30 he refers to the first light, blessed, incorruptible and unbounded, the Father of everything (Patrem omnium),<sup>26</sup> motifs which again have their equivalents in the Apocryphon.<sup>27</sup> However, in I 30 Irenaeus also describes this figure as the first light in the power of Bythus and as First Man,<sup>28</sup> neither of which occurs in the Apocryphon, although they do appear in Valentinianism, which might explain why Irenaeus made use of this system and why he felt it was a source of Valentinian ideas.<sup>29</sup>

But whether Irenaeus gives much indication of it or not, it seems to have been a favourite device of Gnostic tractates dealing with cosmogonical matters to begin with just such a passage of negative apophatic theology as we find in the Apocryphon. It occurs at some length, for example, at the beginning of the Tripartite Tractate,

a work of Christian (Valentinian) Gnosticism,<sup>30</sup> or more concisely in the opening pages of *Eugnostos the Blessed*, a non-Christian work which exists in Christianized form as the *Sophia of Jesus Christ*.<sup>31</sup>

A classic instance of it, even denying existence to the supreme being, something neither the Apocryphon nor the other examples cited go so far as asserting, occurs in Hippolytus' description of Basilides.<sup>32</sup>

Just such a concern with the absolute transcendence of the supreme deity seems to have been characteristic of second century philosophy and theology, pagan and Christian.<sup>33</sup> Perhaps because it was familiar to him, and indeed used by him, and because he had no objection to that aspect of the Gnostic view of God, Irenaeus did not dwell upon it.

If we were to consider the frame story secondary and remove it, such an assertion about the Monad as a *μοναρχία* would be an appropriate, if slightly abrupt, starting point for a work such as the Apocryphon, attempting to explain the nature and origin of our present existence. The Tripartite Tractate starts in a similar abrupt fashion with the Father as a single unique being.<sup>34</sup> But perhaps the most instructive parallel, the beginning of *Eugnostos the Blessed*, after an epistolary introduction, possibly added later to turn an original tract on the higher cosmogony into a letter,<sup>35</sup> sets out the subject in some detail. It enumerates three prevailing philosophical theories about the nature of God and his ordering of the universe and then proceeds to refute them by revealing the truth about God and the heavenly world,

beginning with a piece of negative theology.<sup>36</sup> The way that it has been Christianized by the addition of a frame story and a series of questions to the Saviour by various disciples can perhaps throw some light on the question of whether the same has happened to the Apocryphon. Thus the Sophia opens with the appearance of the risen Saviour to the disciples on a mountain in Galilee to answer certain questions about the origin and ordering of the universe which are perplexing them.<sup>37</sup>

As regards the relationship of the versions we should note that all three are generally in agreement in this passage. In the opening statement BG alone speaks of no one ruling (ἄρχειν) over the Monad since it is a μοναρχία (22,17-19), thus picking up and preserving what would be a natural piece of word-play in the original Greek where

ἄρχη means both rule and beginning. It is also the only version to repeat this idea (23,6ff.), asserting that the supreme being is an ἄρχη over whom no-one rules (ἄρχειν), since there was no-one (or nothing) in existence before him. The play on both senses of

ἄρχη is even more evident in this latter case. As Giversen notes,<sup>38</sup> the connection in Greek between the two senses of ἄρχη as beginning and first power is brought out by the later statements in BG 23,18 and 24,5 that no-one or nothing exists before him, and in 26,8f. that he exists before the All. We might compare this with Hippolytus' account of the Valentinians which begins by saying that for them the beginning (ἄρχη) of everything is a Monad (μονάς), unbegotten, imperishable, inconceivable, incomprehensible etc.<sup>39</sup>





the short, should have omitted it here.

The long recension adds after the passage about no one being Lord over the supreme being that he is not in any kind of subordinate position (CG II 3,1f.; CG IV 4,7f.), the reason being unfortunately obscured by a lacuna in both texts. Krause's reconstruction, ["because there exists no-one who] is in him" does not make much sense. BG 23,7-9 inserts the refrain which continually recurs in this passage: "because no-one (or nothing) exists before him", adding "nor, however ( οὐδὲ ), does he need them". The version in CG IV 4,10 appears to have an equivalent to the last phrase: "he alone [does not need them]", which CG II omits. It is not clear to whom the ["them"] of CG IV 4,10 refers although in BG's version it could refer to the "no-one". If with Wisse's English translation we conjecture that the lacunae in CG II 3,2 and CG IV 4,8 read " [for everything] exists in him",<sup>44</sup> this might supply an object for CG IV's version, and would make more sense of the first part of the original statement in the long recension that the supreme being was not in any inferior position or person. All the texts seem a little confused at this point.

In the passage which describes the supreme being as not perfection, blessedness nor divinity but something far superior,<sup>45</sup> the short recension has a passage stating that the supreme being is neither boundless ( ἄπειρος ) nor bounded but something far

superior (BG 24, 13-15; CG III 5, 8-10), which is lacking in the long version. Krause's note in the apparatus to CG III 5, 8-10 that this was omitted in the long recension because of homoeoteleuton (which in the apparatus to CG II 3, 22 becomes a query; is this lacking in the long version because of homoeoteleuton or does it mark a genuine difference between the two versions?) can now be confirmed with a certain degree of confidence on the basis of the parallel passage in *Allogenes*.<sup>46</sup> It contains the passage present in the short recension but absent in the long.<sup>47</sup>

The short recension also appears to lay much more stress on the character of the supreme being as light. Thus although the long recension apparently agrees with the short in describing the supreme being as "immeasurable light",<sup>48</sup> it does not mention in the catalogue of the positive functions of that being as eternal, life and life-giving etc.,<sup>49</sup> that it is light and light-giving, as the short does.<sup>50</sup> The short adds another reference to the immeasurable light at the end of this same passage,<sup>51</sup> whereas the long speaks at this point of the supreme being as a grace not because he has but because he bestows immeasurable, imperishable mercy.<sup>52</sup> It could be plausibly argued that the version in the long recension is secondary since why the short should have changed such an elaborate statement into a phrase which has already occurred is not at all clear, whereas, as we shall see, the long recension has a certain theological tendency, highlighted by

Giversen, to spiritualize heavenly entities and events, as is the case here. The long recension evidently wishes to insist that these aspects (greatness, eternity, life etc.) are not characteristics which could thus be taken to define the supreme being, but functions of that being, who remains infinite and indescribable, as Giversen notes.<sup>53</sup>

The short recension has two further allusions to the light which are not found in the long. The first is contained in an interjection by the Revealer who asks what can he say to John about the supreme being, the incomprehensible, i.e. the image of the light, in a way which would correspond to his own understanding of that being.<sup>54</sup> The short recension then divides over the continuation: BG 26,4-6 asks who will conceive (  $\nu\sigma\epsilon\lambda\upsilon$  ) that being in a way commensurable with the Revealer's ability to describe him, while CG III 6,16-19 has the Revealer ask who has conceived him and reply that he will tell John in a way corresponding to his (the Revealer's) ability to conceive him. The long recension at this point is content with the Revealer's opening question about what he is to say to John about that being.<sup>55</sup> Giversen argues against Till's suggestion that the original reference to what the Revealer can comprehend should refer to John, pointing out that the version in BG is attempting to explain two things:

- (1) that the Revealer lacks words to describe what he can grasp;
- (2) nor is the Revealer able to describe it in a manner John could comprehend.<sup>56</sup>

Till himself prefers the continuation in CG III,<sup>57</sup> which, unlike the version in BG, suggests that the Revealer has not got a superior comprehension of the supreme being, but can only describe him to the best of his ability. Such an admission by the Revealer may have led BG to recast the passage to give the sophisticated distinction Giversen detects and led the long recension to drop all but the opening sentence. But if this section is indeed original (and certainly both recensions attest an interjection by the main speaker here), and ran roughly as it now does in CG III, this would suggest that at least this part of the Apocryphon was originally a dialogue in which the revealer-figure was not identified as the primal heavenly Revealer who was the first to mediate knowledge of God to his subordinates and then to this inferior realm.

Such an interpretation would appear to be confirmed by the following passage in which there occurs the second reference to light mentioned above. The Revealer proceeds to admit: "None of us knows the situation of the immeasurable being except the one who dwelt in him".<sup>58</sup> The short recension continues: "He is the one who told us this, he who conceives ( νοεῖν ) himself in his own light which surrounds him - he is the source ( πηγῇ ) of the water of life (cf. Rev. 22:1; John 4:14), the light which is full of purity."<sup>59</sup> Hardy and Krause in their respective translations of the Apocryphon draw attention to the parallel to John 1:18 presented by BG at this

point.<sup>60</sup> The long recension, however, breaks the parallel by identifying the one who dwelt in him as the Father.<sup>61</sup> However, the only previous reference to the Father applied to the supreme being himself, the Father of the All.<sup>62</sup> Furthermore the long recension has this Father see the supreme being<sup>63</sup> rather than the latter conceive himself as in the short.

In this whole passage the Revealer – if indeed it is he who is talking and not the author/redactor of the Apocryphon<sup>64</sup> – admits that no-one, including him, knows the nature of the immeasurable One, apart from the one who has dwelt in him (or it, i.e. the immeasurable?). This would correspond to the earlier statement in CG III about the Revealer's limited capacity. Who then has revealed the truth to the Revealer and others ("us")? Both recensions reply: the one who dwelt in the supreme being. But while the long recension identifies the former with "the Father", the short appears to suggest that this former is the supreme being himself, since the description of this former as the one who conceives himself in his own light would best apply to the supreme being, as Janssens admits.<sup>65</sup>

That the long recension should have felt the awkwardness of this and have attempted to safeguard the transcendence of the supreme being by suggesting that it was a subordinate being, "the Father", rather than the supreme deity, who revealed this, is understandable.

It may be, of course, that this whole passage referring to "us"

is a parenthesis by the redactor, influenced by the similar passage in the Fourth Gospel (John 1:16-18) which moves from the comments of John the Baptist in the first person singular to those of the author of the Gospel in the first person plural, culminating in the statement that no-one has seen God but that the only-begotten god who is in the bosom of the Father has made him known. But against that one should note: (1) the previous passage in which the Revealer asks what he can say about the supreme being fits in well with this passage, suggesting that the Revealer is the subject in both; (2) the long recension has failed to note the Johannine echo and has introduced the figure of the Father rather than the Son, which would suggest that for it, too, the Revealer (ie. Christ) is still speaking. Thus both these passages in which the Revealer speaks in the first person singular and plural respectively may be part of the original cosmogonic section, thus suggesting (pace Krause) that it was in the form of a dialogue, or at least of a revelation discourse. Certainly the parallel passage in the Allogenes referred to above is part of a revelation discourse on the supreme being given by the powers of the heavenly Luminaries to Allogenes.<sup>66</sup> Since it is precisely the statement closest to John 1:18 ("apart from the one who dwelt in him. He told us this") which appears to cause all the trouble, we might conjecture that this was added in the process of Christianization.

## The World of Light

### (a) The Appearance of Barbelo

The whole problem of how the diversity and plurality of the heavenly world, and hence, as the result of a fall or defect, our visible world, arose from the perfect unity of the Monad is one which exercised the minds of the Gnostics as it did those of orthodox Christians and pagan philosophers. But over against the tendency of the latter two groups to develop a single answer, the Gnostics present a variety of views reflecting various kinds of imagery. Thus the Apocryphon, after stressing the untroubled rest and silence of the supreme being's aeon (here used in its spatio-temporal sense)<sup>67</sup> refers to the process by which he comes to be responsible for the aeons (here the term is used in its hypostatic sense) and the worlds which emanate from him.<sup>68</sup> This it does in terms of the metaphor of the supreme being as the source (  $\pi\eta\gamma\eta$  ) surrounded by the pure living water of light.<sup>69</sup> That the short recension here represents the supreme being as conceiving or comprehending himself in his own light and then as the source of spirit flowing from (BG), or giving (CG III), the living water of light to supply the ensuing heavenly beings, seems a much more satisfactory representation than that of the long which has someone else (the Father) see the supreme being, thus destroying the process of self-unfolding of the supreme Godhead.

Janssens draws attention to the similar language in John 4:14



and to the use by Heracleon, when commenting on John 4:14, of the verb ἐπιχορηγεῖν . She notes that the water which the Saviour will give is interpreted by Heracleon as from his spirit and his power, and that the "springing up" is referred by him to those who receive what is richly supplied (ἐπιχορηγούμενος) from above, and pour forth on others what has been supplied (ἐπικεχορηγούμενος) to them.<sup>70</sup> Although she notes the use of χορηγεῖν in BG 26,22, she does not refer to the more relevant parallel, ἐπιχορηγεῖν, in CG III 7,7f.

The short recension further develops the play on νοεῖν and its suggestion of mental conception and comprehension to explain how the supreme being is able to produce something. He conceives his own image as he sees it reflected in the pure water of light, a version of the Narcissus motif which was used by the author of the Poimandres to explain how the heavenly Anthropos was attracted down into the irrational earthly body.<sup>71</sup> The long recension appears to be confused at this point and marred by lacunae which makes reconstruction difficult. CG IV 6,26 may, as Krause suggests, preserve the νοεῖν of the short recension, but goes on to obscure the clear imagery of the short by having the supreme being conceive his image in the source of the spirit and in his light water, the source of the pure water of light (6,26 - 9). CG II 4,23-6 is even more lacunous but seems to follow CG IV, filling the lacuna in CG IV 6,27 with a verb which is left hanging with no object and makes no sense.

Continuing the play on  $\nu\omicron\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$ , the Apocryphon then has the supreme being's concept or thought ( $\tilde{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ ) immediately realised and manifested as a distinct hypostasis. She appeared and took up position before him in his gleaming light.<sup>72</sup> This figure is then described. She is the power which is before everything;<sup>73</sup> the one who appeared;<sup>74</sup> the Pronoia of the All;<sup>75</sup> the light which illumines, the image of the light, the image of the invisible;<sup>76</sup> the perfect power.<sup>77</sup> Only at this point does her name occur: she is the Barbelo, the perfect aeon of glory, according to the short recension.<sup>78</sup>

The long recension, however, presents a slightly different picture at this point. It alone mentions that this figure is the image of the invisible virginal ( $\pi\alpha\rho\theta\epsilon\nu\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$ ) Spirit which is perfect.<sup>79</sup> It then continues: this is the power, the glory, Barbelo, the perfect glory in the aeons, the glory of the revelation, the glory of the virginal Spirit. The short recension might be preferable here on the grounds that it represents a simpler (and therefore earlier?) version and that there has been mention of only one aeon so far, the imperishable aeon of the Father. As his hypostatized mental concept or image Barbelo is the perfect aeon.

In what is to become the pattern for succeeding emanations of aeons, Barbelo praises the supreme being because she appeared through him.<sup>80</sup> CG III 7,21 adds a superfluous "praised him" which may represent a misreading of the version in BG 27,17 which continues

the play on  $\epsilon\nu\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$  and  $\nu\omicron\epsilon\iota\nu$  by having her comprehend the supreme being. The long recension omits this perhaps as a further consequence of its failure to recognise the continuing word-play, or perhaps in pursuance of its tendency to give a more sublime and spiritual rendering. That anyone could conceive the supreme being was an idea to be suppressed. But the original presence of that idea may well be confirmed by the following statement that the Barbelo is the first concept (  $\epsilon\nu\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$  /  $\mu\epsilon\epsilon\tau\epsilon\epsilon$  ), the supreme being's image.<sup>81</sup>

The long recension adds two epithets which are omitted by the short, but which are echoed in a description of the Protennoia in the Trimorphic Protennoia of Codex XIII. Thus it describes Barbelo as becoming the womb (  $\mu\eta\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha$  ) of the All because she is prior to them all and as the Mother-Father (  $\mu\eta\tau\rho\omicron\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\epsilon\rho$  ).<sup>82</sup> In the Trimorphic Protennoia, Protennoia describes herself as the Mother and the intangible womb.<sup>83</sup> Further, Irenaeus' account of the Ptolemeans describes how the Father has his Ennoia with him and how he once conceived the plan (  $\epsilon\nu\nu\omicron\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  ) of emanating the beginning of all things and deposited this seed as it were in the womb (  $\mu\eta\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha$  ) of the figure who was with him.<sup>84</sup> Here we find a similar play on  $\epsilon\nu\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$  and  $\epsilon\nu\nu\omicron\epsilon\iota\nu$  and the imagery of the womb. However, the Valentinian imagery is more crude and anthropomorphic and the long recension of the Apocryphon has probably taken the "womb" epithet applied to Barbelo, the Protennoia, from the tradition underlying

the Trimorphic Protennoia rather than itself influencing or being influenced by Valentinian ideas.

According to the short recension Barbelo became a first man, that is the virginal spirit, and she is further characterized by a series of triple epithets; the threefold male; the one with the three powers (CG III 8, 1f. reads: "the one with the three hymns"); the one with the three names (BG 28, 2 adds "the three begettings" while CG III 8, 2f. has "the three powers" here); the aeon which does not grow old; the androgynous who came forth from his Pronoia (or providence).<sup>86</sup> The long recension has the verb ("she became") apply to the womb, the following epithets being in apposition. It reads "the holy Spirit" instead of "the virginal spirit"; agrees with BG over the placing of the three powers (but omits mention of three hymns or three begettings); applies the term "androgynous" to the three names; prefers "eternal" to describe the aeon which it further qualifies as "from the invisibles" and simply speaks of it as "the first to come forth", making no mention of Pronoia.<sup>87</sup> The order (triple male, three powers, three names) found in BG and the long recension is confirmed by a passage in the Trimorphic Protennoia which speaks of the Voice originating from the Thought of the Protennoia existing as three permanences: the Father, the Mother, the Son, and having three malenesses and three powers and three names.<sup>88</sup> This also suggests that the long recension has misplaced the term "androgynous" from its original connection with the aeon.

Now Irenaeus begins his account with the words: "Certain of them (the Gnostics or Barbelognostics) believe that there is a certain ageless (nunquam senescentem; Theodoret Haer. fab. comp. I 13 has ἀνῶλτοθρον ) aeon in virginal spirit whom they call Barbelon (Theodoret has βαρβιλήθρο ). Somewhere they say there is a certain unnameable Father. Now he wished to reveal himself to Barbelo herself. Now this Ennoia came forth and stood in his sight".<sup>89</sup>

The short recension is certainly closer to the account summarised by Irenaeus as regards the ageless aeon. But it seems to identify Barbelo as the virginal Spirit, who must surely represent the supreme being as in the long recension, which had previously alone used the phrase.<sup>90</sup> But the long recension itself proceeds to identify the invisible virginal Spirit, whom the first man addresses, as Barbelo!<sup>91</sup>

However, this latter would appear to be an aberration; elsewhere in the long recension "the virginal Spirit" always applies to the supreme being.<sup>92</sup> In the short recension, on the other hand, "virginal spirit" can be used either to designate Barbelo, as here, or her male consort,<sup>93</sup> or the supreme being.<sup>94</sup> A similar ambiguity might appear to be present in Irenaeus' account. The phrase "quem Barbelon nominant"<sup>95</sup> could apply either to the aeon or to the virginal spirit. Certainly Theodoret by using the neuter relative pronoun ( ὃ ..... ὁνομαζόμενον ) suggests the latter interpretation. But the sense seems to indicate that Barbelo is the subject and that she exists in the supreme being,

the virginal Spirit. Presumably, although Irenaeus does not say so, the unnameable Father is identical with the virginal Spirit. The evidence of the Apocryphon, although divided, does tend to suggest that "virginal Spirit" is a designation that belongs properly and originally to the supreme being, although it could apply by extension to Barbelo, the primary emanation from it. Theodoret himself, although omitting the unnameable Father and apparently identifying Barbelo with the virginal Spirit, suggests by his later statement that Barbelo asks for Prognosis from him ( παρ' αὐτοῦ ) that he has misunderstood Irenaeus, for it is surely absurd for the virginal Spirit, in whom the aeon is, to ask for something from that aeon.<sup>96</sup>

However, although the Apocryphon and Irenaeus' account share certain details at this point they are by no means identical. Whereas Irenaeus depicts Barbelo as a distinct hypostasis within the supreme being to whom the latter wishes to reveal himself, that wish being concretely manifested or hypostatized as Ennoia, in the Apocryphon the conception is much more sophisticated, involving the self-conception of the supreme being in terms of his self-reflection, and the appearance of that conception as his image. However, as we shall see, the account in Irenaeus, although cruder, does suggest an original distinction between Barbelo and Ennoia which has been obscured by the Apocryphon.<sup>97</sup> Irenaeus' account also bears no trace of the ideas of Barbelo praising the Father or appearing as a First Man or as threefold male. However,

the first of these is the consequence of the appearance of an aeon from the supreme being, which would not apply in the case of the Barbelo of Irenaeus' account who is thought of as already present as the recipient of the Father's self-revelation. That the Father's Ennoia becomes a First Man recalls the Ophite system in the following chapter of adv. haer.<sup>98</sup> There the Ennoia of the First Man comes forth<sup>99</sup> and is called the son of him who emits her, and this is the Son of Man, Second Man. It would appear that in both the Ophite system and our present Apocryphon an originally female being, the second highest deity, has been converted into a male.

Some light may be cast on the third point, the question of whether the list of triple attributes was present in the tradition common to the Apocryphon and Irenaeus' account, or whether it represents a later addition, by the evidence of the Valentinian doctrinal letter preserved by Epiphanius and of the Trimorphic Protennoia. The former speaks of the original self-engendered being as called by some an aeon which does not grow old (ἄγῆραςτος), eternally young, male-female (ἀρρενὸς ὁ γυνή),<sup>100</sup> thus perhaps suggesting that this conception, which tallies with details in Irenaeus and the Apocryphon, is more original. The concept of the Protennoia as triple male (which itself contradicts the androgynous nature of the aeon), and having three powers and names, occurs in the Trimorphic Protennoia as a unified whole without any reference to the aeon, but as a description



of the one who exists as Father, Mother and Son.<sup>101</sup> This, of course, was precisely the designation of the Revealer in the frame story<sup>102</sup> who, as we shall see, is also the subject of the triple descent scheme of the revelation discourse or hymn at the end of the long recension.<sup>103</sup> Furthermore, the very odd ascription of praise by the heavenly man Adamas to the invisible Spirit, the Autogenes and the aeons, the three: the Father, the Mother and the Son, the perfect Power,<sup>104</sup> may mark a combination of two ideas which have been left unassimilated, the second involving the figure of Barbelo, the perfect power, with her three names, Father, Mother and Son.<sup>105</sup> In the Untitled Text of the Bruce Codex too there is concealed within the figure called the light or the light-giver an only-begotten ( *μονογενής* ) who manifests three powers.<sup>106</sup>

Thus the Apocryphon, the Trimorphic Protennoia, and the Untitled Text from the Bruce Codex all appear to attest a tradition whereby the primary emanation from the supreme being was conceived of as one yet three, with three names and powers. Both the Apocryphon and the Trimorphic Protennoia attest the role of this figure as revealer/redeemer and as descending three times to save the Gnostics. Such a view may also cast light on the beginning of the Gospel of the Egyptians in which there come forth ( *προέλθειν* ) from the great invisible spirit three powers, the Father, the Mother, and the Son.<sup>107</sup> Each represents an ogdoad brought forth by the supreme Father in silence



and providence (  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\nu\omicron\iota\alpha$  ), the second ogdoad being attributed to Barbelo.<sup>108</sup> Now Barbelo is said (in the short recension) to have come forth from the Father's  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\nu\omicron\iota\alpha$  despite the fact that she herself is called the perfect Pronoia.<sup>109</sup> Although it could be argued that the former reference simply refers to the providential plan of the supreme being, the usage is awkward and could be explained in terms of a tradition akin to that in the Gospel of the Egyptians, whereby the supreme Father produces out of his providence the single figure (Barbelo or whoever) with three names and powers, rather than the three distinct powers.<sup>110</sup>

It may be, therefore, that the Apocryphon and the Gospel of the Egyptians are more closely related at this point than commentators have realised. Certainly it does not seem justified to claim, as Böhlig and Wisse do, that the trinity of Father, Mother and Son in the Apocryphon originates through emanation but that in the Gospel of the Egyptians it is a matter of evolution:<sup>111</sup> both texts bear witness to a tradition which would derive the three or three-in-one directly from the supreme being. Both texts deal with the tradition in different ways: the Apocryphon presenting the figure of the Revealer/Barbelo as three-in-one; the Gospel of the Egyptians presenting her as one of a primal triad deriving from the supreme being; but both bear witness to an even older tradition which has as its basis the original triad of Father, Mother and Son.<sup>112</sup>

Janssens would see in the statements in BG that Barbelo became a First Man and that she proceeded from the Father's  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\nu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ , the creation of a second aeon, who is also an  $\epsilon\nu\nu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ .<sup>113</sup> She notes the comments of Till and Haardt that the text of the Apocryphon has probably omitted the mention of the origin of a second Ennoia, but feels that not enough attention has been paid to the two statements of BG cited above. The First Man is a manifestation, a "Thought" ( $\epsilon\nu\nu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ ) of  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\nu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ .<sup>114</sup> However, as she herself admits, it is not at all clear whether the First Man is a distinct aeon or merely an aspect of Ennoia and the distinction between the two Ennoias remains extremely fluid.<sup>115</sup>

That the First Man is an aspect of Barbelo rather than an independent aeon is suggested both by the continuation in the short recension,<sup>116</sup> which has Barbelo ask the supreme being to give him ( $\nu\alpha\epsilon$  BG 28,6; i.e. First Man) a First Knowledge,<sup>117</sup> and by the confusion in the long recension at this point.<sup>118</sup> It has a masculine subject: "he (i.e. First Man) asked" **and**, failing to recognise that First Man is actually Barbelo, identifies her with the invisible virginal Spirit, contradicting its otherwise universal practice.<sup>119</sup> The fact that the long recension nevertheless retains the feminine ending for the dative ("to give to her":  $\nu\alpha\epsilon$ <sup>120</sup>) despite the masculine subject also confirms the fact that Barbelo was the original subject.<sup>121</sup>

However, Janssens' allusion to the basic trinitarian or tripartite

scheme of the Apocryphon and her illustration of the threefold motif (triple-male, three powers etc.) from the Naassene system, the Gospel of the Egyptians and the Untitled Text from the Bruce Codex are illuminating and tend to support the contention made above that in the latter motif we have a whole independent line of tradition not present in the work summarised by Irenaeus.<sup>122</sup> The introduction of this material, which would appear to embrace the frame story and the revelation discourse at the end of the long recension, has made a considerable contribution to our present Apocryphon as well as being responsible for some of the confusion in passages such as the one we are studying. As we shall see, the confusion over the term  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\gamma\omega\iota\varsigma$  may have resulted from the introduction of this material.

(b) The Pentad

The self-unfolding and self-revelation of the supreme being continues with Barbelo's request (  $\alpha\iota\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$  ) that she be given First Knowledge (  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\gamma\omega\iota\varsigma$  /  $\omega\sigma\epsilon\pi\ \tilde{\nu}\epsilon\ \sigma\sigma\gamma\omega$  ).<sup>123</sup> Theodoret's version of Irenaeus also has Barbelo request (  $\alpha\iota\tau\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$  )  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\gamma\omega\iota\varsigma$  , whereas in the Latin it is the Father's Ennoia who appears and makes the request.<sup>124</sup> The Father nods assent, another recurring motif and part of the pattern of the manifestation of the aeons or hypostases derived from him, which is absent in Irenaeus' summary.<sup>125</sup> Prognosis then appears and takes up position with the Ennoia, which is the Pronoia, according to the short recension,<sup>126</sup> whereas the long has

her do so with the Pronoia, who is one from (or "originates from") the thought (  $\text{M}\epsilon\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$  ) of the invisible virginal Spirit.<sup>127</sup> The short recension evidently feels the need to identify the Ennoia with the Pronoia although both terms have already occurred and been used to designate Barbelo.<sup>128</sup>

The long recension, on the other hand, would appear to distinguish the two: the figure of Pronoia, which occurs here for the first time in the existing texts of CG II and IV (although Krause has plausibly reconstructed it in the lacuna in CG II 4,32 where the parallel in the short recension has it), is the product of the thought (  $\text{M}\epsilon\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$  ) of the Father. If we accept Krause's reconstruction in the above passage, the power which appeared in the Father's thought (  $\text{M}\epsilon\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$  ) is the Pronoia.<sup>129</sup> The Coptic term  $\text{M}\epsilon\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$  in the long recension evidently represents the Greek  $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon\lambda\omicron\varsigma$  of the parallel passages in the short.<sup>130</sup> But although the two passages cited above appear to distinguish the Pronoia and the Father's Ennoia, the long recension does identify the Pronoia with his First Thought (  $\text{M}\epsilon\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$  ).<sup>131</sup> The best solution to the confusion which reigns in the texts is to presume that both recensions were faced with the figure of Ennoia and dealt with the problem of who this represented in different ways. The short recension would appear, like Theodoret, to have identified this Ennoia with Barbelo, the perfect Pronoia. For the long recension, as we shall see, the Pronoia is a key figure who is the subject of the closing

revelation discourse, and whom it has attempted to assimilate more thoroughly into the main exposition. Thus having already related it to the Father's thought (CG II 4,31f.), the long recension has done the same again here, introducing it and deriving it from the Ennoia which originally stood alone at this point.

That this is the case is confirmed by the fact that a few lines later the thought (  $\text{M}\epsilon\epsilon\text{r}\epsilon$  ) again occurs in the list of aeons where one would have expected mention of the Pronoia, if it had been original.<sup>132</sup> It occurs again in the enumeration of the pentad of aeons in apparent distinction from the Pronoia which is defined as the Barbelo.<sup>133</sup>

Prognosis praises the invisible Spirit and the perfect Power, Barbelo, because she originated through her.<sup>134</sup> This pattern is then repeated. She again (i.e. the subject must be Barbelo) makes a request, this time for Imperishability (  $\text{'A}\phi\theta\alpha\rho\sigma\iota\gamma / \text{m}\bar{\text{N}}\tau\alpha\tau\tau\alpha\kappa\epsilon$  ): the Father consents and Imperishability appears, takes her stand with the Ennoia and Prognosis, praising the invisible and Barbelo because she (BG) or they (CG III and CG II) originated through her.<sup>135</sup>

Once again Barbelo makes a request, this time for Eternal Life. Again the Father nods assent and Eternal Life appears. The aeons then take their stand praising the invisible Spirit and Barbelo because they originated because of her.<sup>136</sup> At this point the short recension adds: "through the self-revelation of the invisible Spirit",<sup>137</sup> and concludes this stage by stating that this is the Fifth of the aeons (BG) or the five

aeons (CG III) of the Father.<sup>138</sup> The latter is further identified as the First Man, the image of the invisible, that is Barbelo and Ennoia and First Knowledge (i.e. Prognosis) and Imperishability and Eternal Life. These are further described as the androgynous Fifth (BG) or the androgynous five (CG III), the Tenth of the aeons (BG) or ten aeons of the Father.<sup>139</sup>

The long recension, however, adds a further emanation; Truth.<sup>140</sup> But it is surely significant that the long recension has an exact repetition of the previous formula; they took up position and they praised.<sup>141</sup> This last would appear to be the concluding one embracing all the aeons, and thus one might have expected the long recension to have used a singular verb in the case of Eternal Life taking up her position, as with Prognosis and Imperishability, if the long recension were original here. Moreover, the concluding motive in CG II 6, 1f. unexpectedly has the singular: "through whom (i.e. Barbelo) she had originated", despite the plural form in the two previous instances. The first plural form ἀγ- ("they took up position") might be a mistake for an original ἀε-,<sup>142</sup> but the singular form ("she originated") is very odd after the plural ("they praised") and one cannot easily imagine why, if it had originally been plural, it was ever changed to the singular.

The long recension then inserts the passage about the group of five aeons.<sup>143</sup> It has the term "pentad" ( πεντάς ), speaks of the

First Man as the image of the invisible Spirit and adds "that is the Pronoia" prior to the mention of Barbelo. Both of these are set in double apposition to the First Man and image and are separated off from the other aeons, Thought (  $\mu\epsilon\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$  ), Prognosis, Imperishability, Eternal Life and Truth by the same or a similar conjunction to the conjunction which separates off each aeon (  $\delta\gamma\omega \dots \overline{\mu\eta}, \dots \delta\gamma\omega \dots \delta\gamma\omega \dots \delta\gamma\omega$  ).<sup>144</sup> Thus unless, as with Giversen, one equates Barbelo/Pronoia with Thought (or Ennoia), one has six, not five aeons. Indeed the first figure in the pentad would appear to be the First Man with whom one must equate Barbelo/Pronoia/Thought.

The question naturally arises: which recension is more original, the short which omits the figure of Truth or the long which includes it? We have noted the confusion in the stereotyped pattern of the emergence of Truth in the long recension, but, in fact, there does seem to be similar confusion over that pattern in previous instances. Ideally one would have expected each aeon to appear, take up its position and praise the supreme being and Barbelo to whom it owed its origin, the pattern then being repeated through further requests of Barbelo. The pattern actually begins with the Father's Ennoia appearing and taking up position before the invisible Spirit.<sup>145</sup> Now this precisely echoes the Latin of Irenaeus' account: Ennoeam autem hanc progressam stetisse in conspectu eius.<sup>146</sup> But whereas Irenaeus' account has the Ennoia immediately ask for Prognosis, the Apocryphon piles up a whole series of attributes, including the title of Pronoia, of which Irenaeus' account makes no mention, before it adds that she praised



him (the invisible Spirit, presumably, although he has not been mentioned for several lines) because she appeared through him.<sup>147</sup>

Once again we have a further series of attributes, which we felt to be secondary (First Man, triple male etc.), before we come to this figure's request for Prognosis. Now it is surely significant that the short recension should have to identify the subject of the feminine form of the verb as Barbelo,<sup>148</sup> while the long should start with a masculine form of the verb, linking it with the masculine aeon, but leave in the feminine form of the dative suffix, suggesting that the original subject was feminine too.<sup>149</sup> The Ennoia which then appears and has caused so much confusion to the redactors of both versions is therefore best seen simply as the original subject of this passage, distinct from Barbelo, as in Irenaeus' account. Further, the element which has caused such trouble, namely the formula of praise to (the Spirit and) Barbelo because the aeons originated through her, is not required in Irenaeus' account because Barbelo is the object or recipient of the Father's self-revelation and not, as in the Apocryphon, part of it and responsible for the appearance of each aeon. Indeed, the very combination of an originally distinct Barbelo with the Father's Ennoia can plausibly be shown to be responsible for the present confused state of the Apocryphon.

Irenaeus' account may therefore help cast some light on the questions of the relation of Barbelo to Ennoia and of whether the pentad



of aeons originally combined the two and included Truth. Certainly Irenaeus omits any mention of individual praise as each aeon emerges, and has Imperishability (Incorruptela: Ἀφθαρσία) appear at the joint request of Ennoia and Prognosis.<sup>150</sup> But he does mention, once the four female aeons (Ennoia, Prognosis, Imperishability, Eternal Life) have been united with their male consorts, that they glorified (magnificabant) the great Light and Barbelo.<sup>151</sup> Confirmation of the argument that Barbelo and the four female aeons of Irenaeus and the short recension are more original might also be found in the evidence of the Gospel of the Egyptians. It presents the first emanations from the invisible Spirit as the three powers or ogdoads of Father, Mother or Barbelo, and Son.<sup>152</sup> Now the ogdoad of the Father consists of the four female aeons of Irenaeus' account and the short recension of the Apocryphon (Ἐννοια, Ἀφθαρσία, Eternal Life, Πρόγνωσις) plus three of the male aeons (Ἀόγεσ, Θεέλημα, Νοῦς).<sup>153</sup> Here too Barbelo is distinct from Ennoia, who is part of the ogdoad and self-revelation of the Father, which might confirm the evidence of Irenaeus.

If indeed, as we have argued, the figure of Truth is a secondary addition on the part of the long recension, why was it added? Again reference to Irenaeus' account may supply a clue. It recounts the later emanation of Truth (Alethia: Ἀληθεία) as the female partner of Autogenes.<sup>154</sup> Now, as we shall see, the Apocryphon has evidently

combined the distinct figures of Christ and Autogenes of Irenaeus' account.<sup>155</sup> Thus it has had to reinterpret the mention of Truth as the consort of Autogenes and has simply represented it as an element (or figure) in the Autogenes/Christ which (or who) is made subject to him.<sup>156</sup> The redactor of the long recension, faced with the mention of a pentad of aeons, which, since he identified Barbelo/Pronoia with the Thought, only came to four, must have felt that one had been omitted and searched for a suitable (feminine) candidate. Having come across the mention of Truth at the end of the list of aeons as present in Christ/Autogenes and among all the beings subjected to him, he must have felt that here was the missing aeon and added it. If the version in the long recension was original, as Giversen argues,<sup>157</sup> and the short recension omitted the aeon, why does it play no part in the rest of the work apart from its relation to precisely the figure with whom it is associated in Irenaeus' account? Furthermore, Giversen supplies no convincing reason why the short recension should have omitted it, and declines to discuss the evidence of Irenaeus and Theodoret to which Till had appealed in support of his claim that Barbelo and Ennoia are to be distinguished.

Schenke, in pursuance of his argument that the Apocryphon only knows of three pairs of aeons (the Father -  $\text{ὁ πατήρ}$ , the Consort - **S**ophia and Ialdabaoth -  $\text{ἡ ἰαλδαβαώθ}$ ) and that all other male and female aeons are unpaired, attacks what he sees as the inconsistency in the

description of the pentad.<sup>158</sup> That each of the five female beings (Barbelo etc.) is thought of as split into a male and a female, making ten in all (BG 29, 14-18), contradicts the previous statement that there are only five (BG 29, 8-14). As he points out, these five are purely female in the very closely related system in Irenaeus adv. haer. I 29. Thus he would see BG 29, 14-18 as a later addition.<sup>159</sup> However, he has failed to note that Barbelo in the earlier passage (BG 29, 10-12) is not purely female but described as the First Man. Indeed the latter term may be the key to help explain this odd passage. We ought perhaps to have taken more literally the earlier statement that Barbelo became a First Man, with stress on the becoming.<sup>160</sup> If we understand this reference as anticipatory then the present passage about the pentad represents that event. The image, that which is revealed of the supreme Father, is the First Man. But that self-revelation, that First Man, is precisely the Barbelo and the other hypostatized aspects of the supreme being; Ennoia, Prognosis and so on. Since First Man cannot be simply equated with these female entities and as Barbelo herself is androgynous, so the pentad itself must be androgynous and thus form a decad, which is the Father. The latter, of course, is another designation of the First Man or image of the invisible supreme Father.

It is perhaps instructive to compare the systems found in Irenaeus adv. haer. I 29 and the Gospel of the Egyptians on this point.

In the former the Father's wish to reveal himself to Barbelo is achieved by his self-revelation in terms of the four female hypostatised aspects. When they appear Barbelo glories in them.<sup>161</sup> The four later unite with their male consorts who, apart from Christ, the Son of Barbelo, are also emitted by the Father and form a kind of androgynous tetrad or ogdoad, praising the great Light and Barbelo.<sup>162</sup> In the latter the ogdoad of the Father, the first of three ogdoads which are the first emanations of the great invisible Spirit, is composed of the same four female aspects or hypostases as in Irenaeus' account, and all but Christ of the male aspects or hypostases. Furthermore, they occur in exactly the same order as in Irenaeus' list.<sup>163</sup> The last of the eight is the androgynous Father which might indeed be a suitable collective term for the ogdoad, as the term "Father" appears to be in the case of the Apocryphon's decad.<sup>164</sup>

### (c) Christ and the Male Aeons

Now begins the manifestation of a second series of aeons, which this time are plainly male. The two recensions diverge somewhat over the production of the first of these, the short recension being closer in important details to Irenaeus' account in adv. haer. I 29 than the long. Thus the latter has the Father (i.e. the invisible Spirit?<sup>165</sup>) look at or into Barbelo in the pure light and brightness which surrounds the invisible Spirit. She conceives by him and he begets a spark of light in a light of a blessed likeness but which is not equal to his

greatness.<sup>166</sup> However, if the invisible Spirit is indeed the subject, why does the text speak of the brightness surrounding "the invisible Spirit" and not simply "him"? If the redactor took the subject of the verb "he looked" as the Father, the immediately previous subject and collective term for the decad which includes Barbelo, then how could he have looked into Barbelo who is part of himself, and made her pregnant?

These and other awkward details of the long recension's version, such as the switch from Father (looking) to Barbelo (conceiving) and back to Father (begetting) suggest that the long recension may not be original here. Conversely the short version is more straightforward and is in general agreement with Irenaeus' account of the Barbelo-  
gnostic system. Thus it has Barbelo look intently at the pure light, turn to him and bear a spark of light which is like the blessed light but not equal in greatness.<sup>167</sup> Irenaeus' account has Barbelo looking intently (prospicientem) at the Greatness (magnitudinem) and filled with pleasure at the conception (conceptu delectatam) bear to him a light like him (in hanc generasse simile ei lumen).<sup>168</sup> Thus Irenaeus' account tends to bear out the picture presented by the short recension, although it does appear to hint at the idea that Barbelo becomes pregnant, which is omitted by the short but present in the long.<sup>169</sup> However, in the Apocryphon Barbelo bears a spark (σπινθήρ) of light rather than simply Light, as in Irenaeus' account, and the greatness is not

applied as a title of the supreme being but to the fact that the spark of light, although like the blessed light, is not equal to him. The long recension has evidently misunderstood this last point about the likeness with its reading "he begot a spark of light in light of blessed likeness"; thus its conclusion that it was, however (ἴσος), unequal, loses its force.<sup>170</sup> This last assertion is also missing in Irenaeus' account, perhaps because it was thought unimportant. However, that emanations, even those coeternal with those from whom they emanate, are yet inferior, is apparently an axiom of Gnostic theology.<sup>171</sup>

This being is then described by both recensions as only or only-begotten,<sup>172</sup> but while the short recension speaks of him as appearing to (BG) or in (CG III) the Father, and describes him as the divine Autogenes ( αὐτογενής ), the first-born son of the All (BG) or of all the (children) of the Father, the pure light,<sup>173</sup> the long has him (only-begotten) of the Metropator ( μητροπατήτωρ ) as he appears, and describes him as the self-begotten ( πατὴρ ὁ ὄντως ), the only-begotten of the Father, the pure light.<sup>174</sup> The repetition of only-begotten by the long recension, first with reference to the Metropator who was previously identified as Barbelo,<sup>175</sup> and secondly in relation to the supreme being, might suggest that the long recension is less original here. Certainly it appears to admit that the relation of the Son to Barbelo, the Metropator, is fundamental although it also maintains its own view that he is the son of the supreme Father.

But the important thing to note is that both recensions identify this figure as the Autogenes, whereas for Irenaeus and the Gospel of the Egyptians the two are distinct.<sup>176</sup> However for both the Apocryphon and Irenaeus this being is different from the previous emanations from the Father in that his origin is described in terms of generation. There is therefore some justification for the following statement in Irenaeus that she (i.e. Barbelo) is said to be the origin (initium) of the illumination and generation of everything,<sup>177</sup> although no such statement occurs in the Apocryphon.

The invisible Spirit rejoiced over the Light which had come into existence, the Apocryphon continues, which was first revealed through the first power, his Pronoia, Barbelo (so BG and CG III) or through the first power of his Pronoia, Barbelo (so CG II and CG IV).<sup>178</sup> Again the short recension seems preferable in that Barbelo herself is responsible for generating the spark: the long recension may have misinterpreted the apposition ("his Pronoia ...") as expressing relation, since both phrases (the first power, his Pronoia) would have been in the genitive in the original Greek. The emphasis upon her role might be further support for the short recension's version of how the light-figure originated.

The Apocryphon then relates how the Spirit anointed him with his own goodness<sup>179</sup> so that he became perfect, free from deficiency and Christ, or good (  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  ? ),<sup>180</sup> since he anointed him (BG, CG II)



or since he was anointed (CG III) with the goodness<sup>181</sup> of the invisible Spirit (CG III, CG IV) or with his goodness so as to be (?) the invisible Spirit (BG).<sup>182</sup> The trouble is that all the texts use the abbreviations  $\overline{\text{MNTX}}(\overline{\text{P}})\overline{\text{C}}$  and  $\text{X}(\overline{\text{P}})\overline{\text{C}}$  for what I have translated as "goodness" (  $\overline{\text{MNTX}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{C}}$  ), "Christ" (  $\overline{\text{XP}}\overline{\text{C}}$  ) and "good" (  $\overline{\text{XP}}\overline{\text{C}}$  ), and so one is never entirely sure whether the original Greek read  $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$  or  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$  ,  $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  or  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  , apart from CG III 10,3 which gives the full form (  $\overline{\text{MNTX}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{HC}}\overline{\text{TOC}}$  ). Irenaeus' text may offer us some help here. According to it, the Father, on seeing this light anointed it with his goodness (benignitas; i.e.  $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$ ) so that it became perfect. This, the text continues, is said to be Christ.<sup>183</sup> The Gospel of the Egyptians also speaks of the great Christ (  $\overline{\text{XP}}\overline{\text{C}}$  ) whom the great invisible Spirit anointed.<sup>184</sup> If the main emphasis is laid on the verb ("anoint":  $\chi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu$  ), then the anointed one is clearly Christ, and this interpretation is supported by the evidence of Irenaeus and the Gospel of the Egyptians.

But one must also take into account the evident play on  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  /  $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  underlying this passage, which is confirmed by the  $\overline{\text{MNTX}}\overline{\text{P}}\overline{\text{HC}}\overline{\text{TOC}}$  of CG III 10,3 and the evidence of Irenaeus. As Till suggests, there may be an attempt here to interpret  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  in terms of  $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  ,<sup>185</sup> although, as I have indicated, the primary sense of  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  would already have been evident from the verb in the Greek original. Indeed Böhlig, alluding to this passage in his edition of the Untitled



Tractate from Codex II, rejects Till's translation of BG 30,15:

"he anointed it (the light) with his goodness", and interprets  $\overline{\text{MNTX}}\overline{\text{C}}$  as Messiahship (Messianität :  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$ ).<sup>186</sup> However, such an interpretation is open to question on at least two grounds. First of all, what could the Messiahship or state of being anointed mean in the case of the supreme being? In the case of the light figure, it achieves his perfection; but this cannot apply to the supreme being who is perfect and needs nothing. Secondly, to translate  $\overline{\text{MNTX}}\overline{\text{C}}$  as  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$  destroys the play between  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  and  $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  which underlies both the Apocryphon, as CG III 10,3 indicates, and the parallel account in Irenaeus (and Theodoret).

Janssens has pointed to a similar ambiguity in the abbreviations  $\overline{\text{XC}}$  and  $\overline{\text{MNTX}}\overline{\text{C}}$  as used in the Untitled Text in the Bruce Codex to refer to both Christ and the righteous (  $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  ) and to Christhood or goodness respectively, but has argued persuasively that in the case of the Apocryphon the term "Christhood" cannot apply, whereas to speak of the goodness (  $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$  ) of the supreme being as a special characteristic of him is well attested in Christian and Gnostic circles and makes good sense here.<sup>187</sup>

She also draws attention to the use of the form  $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  to refer to Christ in the Epistle to Rheginus and suggests that this form may not simply be an error.<sup>188</sup> Indeed  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  and  $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  were probably pronounced the same as the evidence of e.g. Suetonius

suggests.<sup>189</sup> But although she supports the interpretation of the various abbreviations in terms of  $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  and  $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$ , she does accept that the former can also equally refer to Christ.<sup>190</sup>

Thus it seems best to accept that here we have a double play on

$\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  /  $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  in which the original sense of each word is significant and is drawn upon to express what is felt to be the full etymology and meaning of the title "Christ". Janssens' argument that the version of BG 30,18f.: "he anointed him with his goodness with a view to (ἐν) the invisible Spirit", over against CG III 10,3f. and CG II 6,26., which speak of the goodness of the invisible Spirit, can be defended since it suggests that the Son thereby becomes identified with the Spirit and his goodness,<sup>191</sup> although plausible, is not entirely convincing.<sup>192</sup>

Wilson has drawn attention to the fact that the name Christ is absent in CG II at this point, but noting the following abrupt mention of the next aeon Nous standing up together with the Christ, has suggested that the short recension may therefore be more original at this point.<sup>193</sup> He is led to ask whether the introduction of the name may be part of a process of Christianization, or whether indeed some versions represent a movement away from Christianity.<sup>194</sup> Certainly the term "Christ" need not necessarily be due solely to Christian influence: its background is in all likelihood the Jewish concept of the Messiah, but that such an exalted heavenly being should require anointing reflects not the Jewish

concept but Christian speculation about the heavenly Christ. Wilson has alluded to the New Testament echoes of this passage without illustration, but we might cite Acts 2:36; 4:27; 10:38; Lk. 4:18 (= Is. 61:1 LXX); Heb. 1:8f. (= Ps 44(45):6f.).<sup>195</sup> Again, as noted above, the figure of the great Christ, who is so named because he was anointed by the invisible Spirit, is central to the Gospel of the Egyptians.<sup>196</sup> Indeed Böhlig and Wisse suggest that the mention of the Christ as distinct from the three-male child with whom he is connected "appears to be evidence of a mythologumenon which was already present beforehand".<sup>197</sup> Again, whatever decision we come to about the dating of the Trimorphic Protennoia (or of its component traditions) or its relation to the Apocryphon, it too bears witness to traditions about Christ and his being anointed as fundamental elements.<sup>198</sup> Furthermore, it is CG II, the very text which omits Christ in our passage, which includes the explicit Christian formulae at the beginning and end of the work. Its omission of the title may therefore not be deliberate but the result of combining the idea that the light-figure became free from defect with the following statement that he became good.

Whatever the original situation may have been in the tradition underlying Irenaeus' account and the Apocryphon, Trimorphic Protennoia, and Gospel of the Egyptians, the mythologumenon of the Son of the supreme Spirit, the Light, being anointed by the Father with his goodness and becoming thereby entitled the Christ, seems a well-

established one by AD 180. Although it owes something to the Jewish concept of the Messiah, it also reflects early Christian speculation.

However, to treat this motif as a later Christian interpolation into an original non- (in the sense of pre-) Christian work, as Arai does,<sup>199</sup> seems questionable, since the mythologumenon is evidently a unified one which fits the whole context very well, which recurs in other texts and in which "Christ" is not self-evidently a later identification with an original "light".<sup>200</sup>

Christ appeared to him, the short recension continues, and received the anointing through (or by) the virginal Spirit, standing before him and praising the invisible Spirit and the perfect Pronoia in whom he had lived (BG), or the one through whom he had appeared (CG III).<sup>201</sup> In the light of the depiction of the manifestation of the previous female aeons as appearing, taking up position before the supreme being and praising him and Barbelo because of whom they originated, the version in CG III would appear to be preferable. For the same reason the version in the long recension would appear to be less original since it apparently has the supreme being stand before the light and pour (the goodness) upon him, before relating how when he had received it he praised the holy Spirit and the perfect Pronoia on behalf of whom he had appeared.<sup>202</sup> But in that BG and the long recension both refer to the perfect Pronoia, this may be more original than CG III which omits to identify her.

Following the customary pattern, the Light/Christ asks for a helper to be given him, namely Nous (νοῦς). At the assent of the invisible Spirit the Nous appeared <sup>and</sup> took up position with the Christ, praising him (Christ? the Spirit?) and Barbelo.<sup>203</sup> Irenaeus' account again closely echoes elements of this: he has Christ again (rursus) ask for a helper ( adiutorium ) to be given him, viz. Nous, and Nous came forth (progressus).<sup>204</sup> The Apocryphon then adds a gloss which appears to mark the end of this particular pattern of emanation and open the way to a new development. "All this", says the short recension, "happened in silence and thought ( ἐν σιωπῇ )",<sup>205</sup> whereas the long makes the Thought ( νοεῖν ) the subject of the following sentence,<sup>206</sup> thus destroying the argument and breaking the pattern. For the long then has the Thought resolve through the word of the invisible Spirit to complete a work,<sup>207</sup> whereas the short makes the invisible Spirit the subject.<sup>208</sup> The consequence is that when this will or resolve becomes concrete as a hypostasis, and, following the accustomed pattern, stands with the Nous and the Light (sic) praising him, the object of praise would now appear to be the Thought rather than the Spirit as in the previous instances and as in the short recension at this point.

Certainly it might be argued that the Thought or Ennoia of the supreme Spirit has been responsible for the production (by emanation or generation) of all preceding aeons, and the appearance of Will and

Word marks a new departure (the breaking of the primal silence) and perhaps a new mode of origin (making a work). Further the long recension's conception of how immanent thought (ἐννοία) expresses itself externally in will and reason or discourse (λόγος) is a plausible and attractive one, which finds echoes in the theories of some Valentinians about the original relation of thought (ἐννοία) and will (θέλημα or θέλησις) to the supreme being as his two consorts or dispositions from which the Pleroma derived,<sup>209</sup> or in the ideas of the immanent and expressed Word (λόγος ἐνδιόθετος and λόγος προφορικός) of the Apologists of the second century.<sup>210</sup> However it would be just as valid and would not involve any break in the pattern of emanation and praise to accept the version in the short recension. After all, the supreme Father has been responsible, directly or indirectly, for the emanation or generation of all the aeons so far. The previous aeons might be said to be all hypostatisations of the Father's internal mental states or conditions (ἐννοία, πρόγνωσις, ἀφθαρσία, ζωὴ ἡ ζωή, φῶς, νοῦς), whereas the last two to appear (θέλημα, λόγος) refer to the external expression of these states, for which the Father is also therefore responsible.

Giversen takes "the thought" of CG II 7,4 with the preceding silence as in the short recension,<sup>211</sup> but he fails to note that if the two were supposed to be coordinated, "thought" ought to have the

indefinite article as "silence" does, representing the Coptic expression of an abstract noun. He is then faced with the problem that the following sentence lacks an identifiable subject, whom he argues must be the invisible Spirit as in the short recension.<sup>212</sup> Further, his suggestion that silence probably represents a term for the Spirit (he cites BG 26,6f.: the Spirit rests in silence), and thought a term for Barbelo, although suggestive, is not convincing. Firstly that everything was caused by the Father and Barbelo is not absolutely true since it overlooks the role of Christ. Again, ⲗⲛ̅ is most naturally translated "in", and finally, as Janssens has pointed out,<sup>213</sup> the Coptic use of the indefinite article suggests that these are abstract nouns, not emanations or aeons, although there may be a play on words here.<sup>214</sup> This might also justify the reading of CG III 10,17 "through a word" where CG II 7,5 and CG IV 10,21 have "through the word": the act of will expressed through a word-event becomes the aeon, Will, and that word-event, the aeon, Word. Thus all four texts agree that the word ( ⲗⲟⲩⲟⲥ : ⲱⲁⲁⲉ ) followed the Will.<sup>215</sup>

This last statement of course does not correspond to the previous pattern of emanation and the reason for this is evidently the following explanatory clause: "For ( ⲓⲁⲣⲉ ) through the word Christ, the divine Autogenes, created everything".<sup>216</sup> In all probability this is a later interpolation which reflects the language and phraseology of John 1:1-3 and may therefore represent part of a Christianizing



tendency.<sup>217</sup> Irenaeus' account, followed by Theodoret, has omitted to mention Will, who is clearly original since he occurs in the following list of paired aeons as the consort of Eternal Life. His account simply adds that in addition to these the Father emitted Logos.<sup>218</sup> Perhaps his eye jumped from the Father's willing to the result of that will, the appearance of Word. Certainly it is clear from his reading of the text that the supreme Father is the originator of the emanation of the aeons, and that at this point he is closer to the short than to the long recension.

Christ is mentioned by all four texts here without any possibility of ambiguity and again identified with the Autogenes. The latter term in its original meaning of "self-alone-begotten", as Giversen points out, cannot properly apply to Christ here: it is true, he argues, only of the invisible Spirit's act which led to the appearance of Christ.<sup>219</sup> Both he and Janssens therefore agree that in this case the Son is given the name of the Father, appealing to the detailed analysis of the term by Charlotte Baynes in her edition of the Untitled Text in the Bruce Codex.<sup>220</sup> But, as Janssens herself admits, the title does not even fit the supreme being properly since he did not produce the Son alone and without a partner. Indeed as she notes,  $\alphaὐτογενής$  in other Gnostic systems, such as that of the Peratae, applies to the intermediate being of the descending triad, Unbegotten (  $\alphaὐτογενής$  ), self-begotten (  $\alphaὐτογενής$  ) and Begotten (  $γεννητός$  ).<sup>221</sup>



Moreover, on the only occasion where the appellation "the divine Autogenes" is applied to the great, invisible Spirit (CG III 11,4) the text is evidently corrupt, for this figure is immediately identified as the Son of Barbelo. Everywhere else the divine Autogenes is equated with Christ.<sup>222</sup>

However, in Irenaeus' account, the Autogenes is not identified with Christ but is a later emission from the union of the aeons Ennoia and Logos.<sup>223</sup> In the Gospel of the Egyptians, too, the term αὐτογενής is applied not to Christ, the Son of the Silence (σιγή), who came forth from the invisible Spirit, but to the Word, the son of Christ.<sup>224</sup> This may suggest that the concept of the Autogenes, which originally applied to what the supreme Father produced without a partner, an idea of which there are still traces in Irenaeus' account,<sup>225</sup> has been artificially combined with the figure of the Light/Christ by the authors of the Apocryphon. As we shall see, it may be this combination which has caused the confusion present in the following section of the Apocryphon and which may go some way towards explaining its differences from Irenaeus' account.

Thus while the latter relates how syzygies were then formed between the male and female aeons; Ennoia with Logos, Imperishability with Christ, Eternal Life with Will and Nous with Prognosis, and how these praised the great light and Barbelo,<sup>226</sup> the Apocryphon suddenly and without explanation lists four of the aeons, Eternal Life and Will,

Nous and Prognosis, and their standing and praising the invisible Spirit and Barbelo.<sup>227</sup>

The reason for their praise, that they had originated through Barbelo,<sup>228</sup> is not strictly true of the male aeons, Will and Nous, which might cast some doubt on the originality of this presentation. Giversen is also led to deduce that the text is corrupt at this point.<sup>229</sup> He refers to Schmidt's conclusion in the case of BG that the text should be emended in accordance with Irenaeus' account and the evidence of Theodoret. Since the two pairs corresponded to the last two of Irenaeus, and the  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\eta}\varsigma$  is in complete isolation, one would be justified in filling the gap by adding  $\epsilon\upsilon\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$  and  $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\alpha\phi\theta\alpha\rho\iota\varsigma$  and  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ .<sup>230</sup> Till, however, notes Giversen, felt such an emendation to be attractive, but argued that only a few of these beings were mentioned and that there was no question of them being arranged in pairs, an arrangement which was therefore unknown to the underlying version of the Apocryphon.<sup>231</sup> Giversen himself argues that Schmidt and Till have overlooked the fact that the arrangement of the world of light began as an account of the genesis of the pentad, which was described as androgynous and as the decad of the aeons.<sup>232</sup> Since it is androgynous we are then told of the origin of the masculine partners.<sup>233</sup>

Giversen then attempts to reconstruct his original ten aeons, employing Irenaeus' account and the versions of the Apocryphon in

BG, CG III and CG II. As he points out, Schmidt had rejected the figure of Aletheia who was emitted with the Autogenes in Irenaeus' account, being unaware of the description of the genesis of Truth which was only present in CG II.<sup>234</sup> Irenaeus or his source have perpetrated a misunderstanding based on the confusion between  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  and  $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ . Irenaeus' text read  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$  instead of an original  $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$ , while a Coptic scribe read  $\overline{\chi\rho\epsilon}\overline{\epsilon}$   $\overline{\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\gamma\epsilon\kappa\eta\eta\epsilon}$   $\overline{\pi\eta\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon}$  as one being, the Autogenes, and missed out the intervening figure of Truth.<sup>235</sup>

The conjecture is ingenious but problematic. Firstly, the original pentad are clearly female, since as Schenke has pointed out, two of them (Imperishability and Prognosis) produce offspring as the consorts of male aeons.<sup>236</sup> The reference to them as androgynous is either inaccurate or an anticipation of the later appearance of five male aeons. Secondly, a Coptic  $\overline{m\eta\tau\chi\rho\epsilon}$  would presuppose that the Greek text read  $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$  whereas what we really require here is a masculine noun for the aeon to preserve the pattern. But precisely because the Coptic has  $\overline{m\eta\tau\chi\rho\epsilon}$  we cannot assume an original  $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$ , which would preserve it. Further, Giversen's supposition of the second pair as  $\acute{\alpha}\phi\theta\alpha\rho\sigma\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  and  $\chi\rho\eta\sigma\tau\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$  is contradicted by the appearance of the four luminaries from the Light, that is Christ ( $\overline{\pi\epsilon\chi\epsilon}$ ) and Imperishability,<sup>237</sup> a passage which has an exact parallel in Irenaeus' account.<sup>238</sup> Moreover Theodoret at this point

speaks of emanations arising " ἐκ τοῦ Φωτὸς καὶ τῆς Ἀφθαρσίας ".<sup>239</sup>

All the evidence would therefore suggest that the original pair was

Φῶς and Ἀφθαρσία, a male and a female aeon,<sup>240</sup> and that

in the process of Christianization the anointed Light became identified not only with Christ, as in Irenaeus' version, but also with the Autogenes. Giversen's supposition of Goodness as the original partner of Imperishability on the basis of the mention of the Spirit anointing the Son with it is clearly weak since no mention has been made of the origin of such an aeon: but his suggestion that the figure he identifies as Goodness and the Autogenes were originally distinct, and that the confusion of the two led to the omission of Aletheia is revealing and may point to a solution.

Janssens has drawn attention to the fact that the four aeons who are referred to as praising the Spirit and Barbelo are treated as two pairs by the use of conjunctives, particles and asyndeton.<sup>241</sup>

Furthermore, the order (Eternal Life/Will; Nous and Prognosis) with its reversal of the order of emanation or of a male/female pattern precisely reflects the order of Irenaeus' description of the union of the aeons (in which the females precede the males until Nous), and also the order in the Gospel of the Egyptians' list of the first ogdoad.<sup>242</sup>

As noted above, BG took the Autogenes with this list and the long recension made the Ennoia the instigator of a new development in association with or by means of the Word. Now if, as I have argued,

the Apocryphon identified the originally distinct figure of the Autogenes, who was produced by the union of Ennoia and Logos according to Irenaeus' account,<sup>243</sup> with Christ, then this might explain the evident confusion in the Apocryphon at this point and the differences from Irenaeus' version. Faced with two distinct accounts of the genesis of Autogenes/Light/Christ (whom they treat as one figure), the first through the Barbelo (the first  $\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\omicron\iota\varsigma$  ), the second occurring later through the Ennoia and the Logos, the redactors of the Apocryphon had to abandon one, and thus the Ennoia/Logos account, being later, was removed or reinterpreted. The Ennoia was made responsible for the appearance of Will through the agency of the Logos as in the long recension, or entirely omitted as in the short.

This surmise is confirmed by the following passage in the Apocryphon. The long recension has the holy Spirit perfect the divine Autogenes and the Barbelo,<sup>244</sup> despite the fact that the former has already been perfected through his anointing.<sup>245</sup> His subsequent taking up position by the great, invisible virginal Spirit as divine Autogenes and appearance through the Pronoia<sup>246</sup> would also appear to be a doublet, since similar events have already been described,<sup>247</sup> unless we have here the description of the original appearance of Autogenes as an aeon distinct from Christ, as in Irenaeus. The versions in CG III 11,3-6 and BG 32, 3-8 are even more confused. The former has the divine Autogenes, who is identified with the great invisible Spirit,

yet perfecting himself so as to stand by the latter (!), while BG refers to the Spirit of the great (or divine) Autogenes being praised by the aeons because he took up position by the eternal, virginal, invisible Spirit. Both versions are evidently nonsensical.

However, the continuation in the short recension, which relates how the Autogenes god, Christ, is the one whom he (the invisible Spirit) honoured with great honour because he had originated from his first  $\epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\omicron\iota\varsigma$ , the one whom the invisible Spirit set as god over all things (CG III) or the All (BG),<sup>248</sup> makes good sense and is strikingly similar to Irenaeus' account. The latter has Autogenes emitted from Ennoia and Logos to "represent" (ad repraesentationem) the great light, and greatly honoured (valde honorificatum) and all things subjected to him (et omnia huic subjecta).<sup>249</sup> The long recension, in that it has the Autogenes honoured with a loud voice and appearing through the Pronoia, would appear to be less original here.<sup>250</sup> But both recensions show possible signs of Christian colouring at this point. Thus the short recension has the Spirit set the Autogenes god, Christ, as god over the All, or all things, recalling Rom. 9:5,<sup>251</sup> while the long has him appointed the head of the All, which is perhaps closer to Eph. 1:22,<sup>252</sup> The continuation in BG 32, 14f.: "The true God gave him all power ( $\pi\acute{o}\tau\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota$ )" (which CG III 11, 11 may have omitted through homoeoteleuton as Krause suggests,<sup>253</sup>) offers perhaps a clearer parallel to the New Testament, recalling Matt. 28:18, as

Wilson points out.<sup>254</sup>

The further subordination ( ὑποτάσσεται ) of the truth which is in the Autogenes to him so that he should comprehend ( νοεῖν ) the All (BG) or all things (CG III), which the short recension then relates,<sup>255</sup> has been combined by the long recension with the previous reference to the power. Thus it has all power subjected ( ὑποτάσσεται ) to the Autogenes as well as the truth in him, and adds that he was called by a name which is more exalted than every name.<sup>256</sup> The latter thus obscures the echo of Matt. 28:18 but balances this by adding an allusion to Phil. 2:9.<sup>257</sup> But if the Autogenes of the Apocryphon is seen here as the object of Christianization in that he is identified with Christ and depicted in terms of New Testament conceptions and allusions, the same must be admitted, if to a less advanced degree, of the Autogenes of Irenaeus' account. He is distinct from Christ, the Light, yet in the language of Hebrews 2:6-8, Philippians 2:9f. and Ephesians 1:21f. he is greatly honoured and everything is subjected to him. Thus for the Gnostics or Barbelognostics of Irenaeus both the Light/Son and the Autogenes appear to have been identified separately with the figure of Christ, whereas the Apocryphon seems to have fused the Son and the Autogenes together.

The result of this fusion has meant that the figure of Aletheia, who was emitted with the Autogenes as his female consort in Irenaeus' account,<sup>258</sup> has had to be reinterpreted. Both long and short recensions



thus simply make her a quality present in Autogenes, while the long has also pressed her into service as a fifth female aeon which it requires to complete the pentad, since it has identified the originally distinct figures of Barbelo and Ennoia. If therefore our contention about the original independent status both of Barbelo and Ennoia and Christ and Autogenes is correct, we should take more seriously the evidence of Irenaeus about the syzygies of four female and four male aeons all derived directly (apart from the Light/Christ) from the Father as aspects of his being expressed as concrete hypostases. Certainly the Valentinian systems described by Irenaeus all presuppose that the heavenly world or Pleroma is produced by successive pairs of male and female aeons uniting and bringing forth.<sup>259</sup> Further, both the primal "Pythagorean Tetrad" of Primal Cause and Ennoia or Silence, Nous and Truth, and the second Tetrad of Logos and Life, Man and Church, which constitute the primordial Ogdoad, have aeons in common with the list in the Apocryphon and Irenaeus. However, in the Valentinian systems the pattern is of a male and a female aeon being produced then uniting to produce another male and female; the last two pairs, Logos and Life, Man and Church, being responsible for ten aeons and twelve aeons respectively.<sup>260</sup> Conversely, the Apocryphon and Irenaeus' account have first four female and then four male aeons, if we accept that the Apocryphon's motif of the pentad is a later tradition. But, as we shall see, in both the Apocryphon



and Irenaeus a male and female aeon are responsible for further offspring.

We have also appealed to the evidence of the Gospel of the Egyptians to support our view of the originality of Irenaeus' presentation of the syzygies of the aeons and the later origin of Autogenes as a figure distinct from the Son. As we have seen, it deals with the three ogdoads which first emerged from the invisible Spirit, those of the Father, the Mother Barbelo, and the Son.<sup>261</sup> Although the Gospel of the Egyptians clearly differs greatly from the Apocryphon and Irenaeus' account of the Barbelognostics, it preserves Barbelognostic traditions on the aeons and the luminaries which can illuminate the question of how these traditions are employed in the Apocryphon. On the matter of whether the male and female aeons originally formed a pentad or androgynous decad as the Apocryphon appears to assert according to Giversen, we should note that the Gospel of the Egyptians speaks of an ogdoad, that of the androgynous Father, which contains seven of the eight aeons of Irenaeus' list, following his order exactly.<sup>262</sup>

But the pattern in Irenaeus of female then male until the last two, which are reversed, is broken in the Gospel of the Egyptians in that there is no male aeon between Ἀφ' ὧν αἰεὶ and Eternal Life corresponding to the Light/Son/Christ of Irenaeus. The Son, of course, is present as the first member of the third ogdoad, as Barbelo is the first of the second. However the second and third ogdoads are evidently

artificial constructions since that of the Mother is made up of obscure secret names over which the versions in CG III and CG IV disagree, and which do not appear to be paralleled elsewhere,<sup>263</sup> while that of the Son is made up to eight by reference to seven powers, possibly the planets.<sup>264</sup> Moreover, as Böhlig and Wisse point out, the Father and the Son remain anonymous and only the Mother is identified, as Barbelo.<sup>265</sup> They argue from an analysis of the recurring pattern of presentations of praise that the original sequence was most likely: (1) the great invisible Spirit; (2) the Barbelo; (3) the thrice-male child etc., which has been modified to incorporate the trinity of Father, Mother, and Son evolving from the great invisible Spirit, and to include a second trinity (thrice-male child, Youel and Esephech).<sup>266</sup> The Gospel of the Egyptians would therefore appear to have drawn upon a Barbelognostic tradition involving the supreme trinity of Father, Mother and Son which derived the heavenly world from the production and hypostatisation by the Father, through the efforts of Mother and Son, of his internal mental processes and characteristics.

#### (d) The Four Great Luminaries

Despite the earlier lack of decisive evidence that the Apocryphon presents the male and female aeons as paired, it now relates how from the male aeon the Light, namely Christ, and the female aeon Imperishability, the four great luminaries (ΟΥΟΕΙΝ / ΦΩΣΤΗΡ )

appeared.<sup>267</sup> However, unlike Irenaeus' account which is very close in word order and terminology to the Apocryphon,<sup>268</sup> the latter adds that this took place through the god of the Spirit (long recension) or god, the invisible Spirit (CG III), from the divine Autogenes.<sup>269</sup> The last statement is clearly awkward since Christ is the Autogenes according to the Apocryphon and he is thus mentioned twice as the origin of the luminaries. Either Christ and Imperishability were the progenitors or the Autogenes (i.e. Christ) alone. Schenke's claim that the attribution to Christ and Imperishability is secondary and that the original probably read: "From the Light .... through the divine Autogenes the four luminaries appeared",<sup>270</sup> totally overlooks the Apocryphon's identification of the Light and the Autogenes. Furthermore, it is his argument that the aeons of the Apocryphon were originally unpaired which leads him to ignore the evidence of the Apocryphon in this way and undervalue the testimony of Irenaeus. The very attempt to involve the Autogenes in this secondary fashion lends further confirmation to the hypothesis that the Apocryphon has artificially combined the originally separate figures of the Light/Christ and the Autogenes. Irenaeus' version may again be closer to the original tradition.

The continuation in the Apocryphon, which has the four take up position by the Autogenes,<sup>271</sup> echoes the pattern of previous emanations of aeons, according to which each takes his stance beside the one who

preceded him.<sup>272</sup> This, plus the striking parallel in Irenaeus' account which has the luminaries emitted ad circumstantiam Autogeni,<sup>273</sup> might add further weight to the argument that the Autogenes, as in Irenaeus' version, was originally distinct from the Light/Christ, and produced just before the appearance of the luminaries.

But where Irenaeus recounts the emanation of four beings from Will and Eternal Life (another male and female pair), Charis, Thelesis, Synesis and Phronesis (all Greek feminine nouns) to assist the four luminaries,<sup>274</sup> the Apocryphon abruptly mentions three aeons, the Will, the Ennoia and the Life.<sup>275</sup> What their precise grammatical or syntactical link with what precedes and what follows is not at all clear.<sup>276</sup> Thus the short recension equally abruptly proceeds to speak of "the four" (BG) or "his four" (CG III), which are enumerated as  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$  ,  $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$  ,  $\alpha\iota\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  and  $\phi\rho\acute{o}\nu\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  .<sup>277</sup> The long, no less mysteriously, refers to the four powers which it lists as prudence (  $\mu\eta\tau\rho\mu\eta\tau\eta\tau$  ),  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$  ,  $\alpha\iota\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  and  $\phi\rho\acute{o}\nu\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  .<sup>278</sup> As Giversen notes,<sup>279</sup>  $\mu\eta\tau\rho\mu\eta\tau\eta\tau$  is an apt translation of  $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$  , and since CG II proceeds to cite  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$  first,<sup>280</sup> there is no real disagreement between the versions. However, Irenaeus' account and the Apocryphon do diverge in that whereas the former has Thelesis in second place, the Apocryphon has  $\alpha\iota\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  third. But this divergence is perhaps lessened by the fact that in the ensuing attribution of aeons to the four luminaries

in the Apocryphon the order is  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$  ,  $\alpha\iota\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  ,  $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$  .<sup>281</sup> Moreover the Gospel of the Egyptians lists the consorts (  $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\zeta\upsilon\gamma\omicron\varsigma$  ) of the four great luminaries (  $\phi\acute{\omega}\sigma\tau\eta\rho$  ) in the order  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$  ,  $\alpha\iota\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  ,  $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$  ,  $\phi\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  .<sup>282</sup> As Harvey notes, the Clermont MS of Irenaeus reads Enthesin at this point and Thesin later, in association with the second luminary, Raguel.<sup>283</sup> Thus the Greek original may have read  $\alpha\iota\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  , which was misunderstood or miscopied in the Latin. The form Thelesin may have been a further attempt at emendation suggested perhaps by the fact, also indicated by Harvey, that Raguel is its Hebrew equivalent (i.e. will of God).<sup>284</sup>

Although the Gospel of the Egyptians differs from Irenaeus' account (and the Apocryphon) over the origin of the four luminaries, who are produced by the power of the great light, the Manifestation (  $\pi\rho\omicron\phi\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  ), as a result of the request of Adamas,<sup>285</sup> it bears out Irenaeus' presentation of the great luminaries and their female consorts to whom they are united. The Apocryphon, on the other hand, evidently lacks an element explaining the relation of the three abruptly-named aeons to the four powers, and the origin of the latter. Indeed the three abruptly-mentioned aeons could be reduced to the two who are responsible for the emission of the four luminaries in Irenaeus' account.<sup>286</sup> The secondary nature of the Apocryphon at this point is also perhaps confirmed by the confused nature of the continuation.

Thus, although like Irenaeus' account and the parallel in the

Gospel of the Egyptians it associates Grace (  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$  ) with the first luminary, Harmozel (BG) or Armozel (CG III, CG II, CG IV), the angel of the first aeon (short recension) or first angel,<sup>287</sup> it proceeds to abandon this pattern of ascription in the cases of the other three powers. Thus the short recension associates three aeons with the first aeon (in whom the luminary is), which it names as  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$ , truth and form (  $\mu\omicron\rho\phi\eta$  ),<sup>288</sup> while the long, having identified the luminary and the aeon, associates them with it.<sup>289</sup> With the second luminary Oroiael, the Apocryphon continues, which is set over the second aeon, there are another three aeons,  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\nu\omicron\iota\alpha$  (short recension) or  $\epsilon\pi\iota\nu\omicron\iota\alpha$  (long),  $\alpha\iota\sigma\theta\eta\varsigma\iota\varsigma$ , and remembrance (  $\mu\nu\eta\mu\eta$  /  $\pi\bar{\pi}\pi\mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon$  ).<sup>290</sup> If the Apocryphon was indeed continuing the pattern of ascribing each of the four powers in turn to one of the luminaries, why does it put  $\alpha\iota\sigma\theta\eta\varsigma\iota\varsigma$  second?

With the third luminary, Daueithe, the text goes on, which was set over the third aeon, are three more aeons:  $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$  /  $\mu\bar{\eta}\tau\epsilon\rho\mu\bar{\eta}\zeta\eta\tau$ ,  $\alpha\gamma\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta$  and  $\iota\delta\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$ .<sup>291</sup> The short recension speaks finally of the fourth luminary, Eleleth, who is set over the fourth aeon, and his three aeons, perfection (  $-\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\varsigma$  ),  $\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\eta}\nu\eta$  and  $\sigma\omicron\phi\iota\alpha$ .<sup>292</sup> At this point the long recension diverges and has the fourth aeon set over the fourth luminary,<sup>293</sup> but this reverses the pattern up till now and is evidently secondary. If the Apocryphon were intending to identify the four powers  $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$ ,  $\alpha\iota\sigma\theta\eta\varsigma\iota\varsigma$ ,

εὐνοίας and φρόνησις as aeons belonging to the first, second, third and fourth luminaries respectively, why has it omitted φρόνησις ? Giversen's attempt to argue that σοφία is intended as an equivalent is not very convincing particularly in the light of the evidence of Irenaeus and the Gospel of the Egyptians. The Apocryphon finally lists these latest emanations as the four luminaries who stand by the divine Autogenes and the twelve aeons who stand by the youth (short recension) or son (long), the great Autogenes Christ.<sup>294</sup>

But the versions disagree over the additional statement over who was ultimately responsible for this. Thus BG 34,12f. states that the four and the twelve took their stance by the Autogenes through the good pleasure (εὐδοκία) of God, the invisible Spirit, while CG II 8,24f. asserts that it was through the resolve (οὐλοῦν) and God the invisible Spirit. The text in CG III 12,19-22 is confused: it has the twelve aeons take up their position through God and the good pleasure (εὐδοκία) and the great Autogenetor Christ, then repeats through God and the good pleasure of the invisible Spirit. The first reference to God etc. is evidently a doublet and the version in BG is perhaps preferable to the other two in that it makes most sense. Finally, the immediate continuation in the Apocryphon, which insists that the twelve aeons belong to the Son, the Autogenes,<sup>295</sup> appears redundant since a similar statement has just been made.

That last statement, however, with its insistence that the aeons

should be associated with the Autogenes, may add further confirmation to the hypothesis we have been developing on the basis of the inconsistencies in the treatment of the luminaries and aeons by the Apocryphon, namely that the four luminaries and their powers (or consorts according to the Gospel of the Egyptians) are to be distinguished from the Autogenes and the aeons. Thus Irenaeus' account relates how from Will and Eternal Life four emissions were made to help the four luminaries, Charis, Thelesis, Synesis, Phronesis. Charis was united to the first great luminary, Armoges, Thelesis to the second, Raguel, Synesis to the third, David, and Phronesis to the fourth, Eleleth.<sup>296</sup> There is no indication that the luminaries are associated with aeons or that their consorts are aeons. This is confirmed by the Gospel of the Egyptians, which has retained this tradition about the luminaries and their consorts, but adapted it to fit its own scheme. It too lists the four luminaries as Harmozel, Oroiael, Daueithe and Eleleth<sup>297</sup> and their consorts (σύνζυγος) as respectively χάρις, ἀϊσθησις, σὺννοσις and φρόνησις, who together form the first ogdoad of the divine Autogenes.<sup>298</sup>

This very much confirms the picture presented by Irenaeus in that again there is no indication that aeons are involved here. What is interesting about the Gospel of the Egyptians, however, is that it proceeds to list a second ogdoad of four ministers for the great luminaries (again with Hebrew names), Gamaliel, Gabriel, Samlo (or Samblo) and



Abrasax and their four consorts (again Greek feminine nouns),

$\mu\upsilon\eta\mu\eta$  ,  $\lambda\gamma\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta$  ,  $\epsilon\iota\rho\acute{\eta}\nu\eta$  and Eternal Life, of which  
 the first three occur, in the same order, as aeons of the second,  
 third, and fourth aeons of the Apocryphon.<sup>299</sup> Where the Apocryphon  
 presents a confused picture which combined the notion of four aeons  
 in the spatio-temporal sense, over each of which is a luminary with  
 whom is associated those (other) aeons in the sense of hypostases, the  
 Gospel of the Egyptians offers an orderly scheme of male and female  
 in two ogdoads which can be seen as the bridge between Irenaeus'  
 account (which only has the first eight) and the Apocryphon which has  
 four luminaries, four (spatial) aeons, and twelve (hypostasised?)  
 aeons.

That the Apocryphon has combined two schemes, one consisting  
 of the four luminaries and their consorts, the other of the Autogenes  
 and his four aeons (in the spatio-temporal sense) and twelve aeons (in  
 the hypostasised sense) is borne out by a comparison of other texts  
 from Nag Hammadi which contain these ideas. Thus the Gospel of the  
 Egyptians appears to envisage the four aeons as established by the

$\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\gamma\epsilon\lambda\acute{o}\varsigma$  Word/Logos, and the four luminaries (and their con-  
 sorts etc.) as produced to complete the four aeons.<sup>300</sup> This distinction  
 is also present in Zostrianos from Codex VIII (CG VIII, 1), where the  
 four aeons are presented as four successive stages of ascent for the  
 Gnostic initiate or future revealer<sup>301</sup> and as self-begotten but under

the control of, or parts of the  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\gamma\ \epsilon\nu\acute{\eta}\varsigma$  God.<sup>302</sup> Over them, as in the Apocryphon, are set the four luminaries (  $\phi\omega\sigma\tau\eta\rho$  ), Armozel, Oroiael, Daueithe and Eleleth.<sup>303</sup> A later passage associates the aeons with their respective lights and gives the name of each light followed by three names of Greek form, which may be meant as attributes or alternative names.<sup>304</sup>

In Melchisedek from Codex IX (CG IX,1) too, we hear of Jesus Christ the commander-in-chief of the four luminaries with no indication that they are to be identified as aeons.<sup>305</sup> Finally, the Trimorphic Protennoia seems to betray the same combination of the two schemes as the Apocryphon. Thus it speaks of the (four?) aeons (in the spatio-temporal sense) who originated through the self-begotten god, Christ, but confusingly proceeds to relate how each was set over an aeon, the first, second, third and fourth. The last of the three names given to each aeon is the name of a luminary in the order (Armozel), Oroiael, Daueithai, Eleleth.<sup>306</sup> That the document then mentions the great light Eleleth suggests that the previous passage has confused the originally distinct entities of aeons and luminaries, as has the Apocryphon, perhaps because, as with the Apocryphon, it has identified the Autogenes and the Christ.<sup>307</sup> The evident confusion in the Apocryphon and the parallel evidence from other related works from Nag Hammadi thus suggest that Irenaeus' scheme of the four luminaries and their consorts, which the Gospel of the Egyptians

attests and has expanded, has been modified by the Apocryphon by the addition of an independent tradition involving the four spatio-temporal aeons of the Autogenes. The consorts of the luminaries together with consorts of the ministers of the luminaries in the tradition preserved by the Gospel of the Egyptians have been worked into a scheme of twelve aeons as hypostases. The last occurs as an independent motif in the Untitled Text from the Bruce Codex<sup>308</sup> and acts not only as the heavenly archetype for the signs of the Zodiac created by the Demiurge, Ialdabaoth, but makes room for the figure of Sophia as the last aeon, the furthest from the Father and Barbelo and the cause of the origin of this visible defective universe.

(e) The Origin of heavenly Adamas and Seth

The Apocryphon concludes the previous stage by the summary: all things (BG) or the All (CG II) were confirmed according to the will of the holy Spirit through the Autogenes.<sup>309</sup> The first part of BG's version would appear to be exactly paralleled by the Latin of Irenaeus: Confirmatis igitur sic omnibus,<sup>310</sup> while the second half bears out the earlier statement that the Autogenes was set over everything, and reasserts the idea of the divine providence. The stage is thus set for a new emanation. The Apocryphon thereupon relates how from Prognosis and the perfect Nous (i.e. a syzygy of male and female aeons?) through the good pleasure of the invisible Spirit and

the Autogenes, there originated the perfect true Man, the first revelation.<sup>311</sup> Irenaeus' account, however, has him emitted (Theodoret:  $\pi\rho\omicron\beta\alpha\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ ) by Autogenes, with no mention of Nous and Prognosis, who alone of the four pairs are not responsible for anything.<sup>312</sup> Although the Gospel of the Egyptians appears to represent the Word/Logos as responsible, if indirectly, for the manifestation of the incorruptible Man, Adamas,<sup>313</sup> it is perhaps better to accept the Apocryphon's version, which supplies a role for the Nous and Prognosis and associates the Autogenes with their action. In this case the Apocryphon has perhaps preserved a more original concept which had been reinterpreted in Irenaeus' source. Alternatively Irenaeus, in his concern for brevity, may have omitted to mention the association in the Apocryphon of the Autogenes with the previous emanations but brought him in here as the last-named being, failing to spot the actual "parents".

The versions disagree over the precise name of heavenly Man. While BG 35,5 has him called "Adam",<sup>314</sup> CG III 13,4 prefers "Adamas"<sup>315</sup> and CG II 8,34f. has the strange form "Pigera Adaman" ( $\overline{\pi\iota\gamma\epsilon\rho\alpha\delta\alpha\delta\mu\alpha\delta\alpha}$ ).<sup>316</sup> Giversen attempts to argue that the text should be read "now the name is Adamas" ( $\overline{\pi\iota} \gamma\epsilon \overline{\rho\alpha}$  (for  $\rho\delta\alpha$ )  $\delta\alpha\delta\mu\alpha\delta\alpha$ ), but the other instances of the form Pigeradamas or Geradamas,<sup>317</sup> and the fact that both elements of the word have the supralinear stroke used in the Apocryphon and other Coptic Gnostic texts to denote a proper name,

militate against his conjecture.<sup>318</sup> Irenaeus' account derives the name "Adamas" from the fact that neither he himself, nor those from whom he originated were subjugated (domatus).<sup>319</sup>

That Adamas is the first revelation or manifestation, an epithet which appears to contradict what has already been said of Barbelo as Giversen notes,<sup>320</sup> is best seen in the light of the later revelation of the Father (short recension) or Mother-Father (long) to the archons of Ialdabaoth in the form of the first, perfect Man, and their creation of earthly man in the image and with the name (Adam) of the heavenly Primal Man.<sup>321</sup> As Janssens also notes, we have here the first manifestation of the heavenly Anthropos in the sense that he will be the first aeon to be revealed outside the world of light.<sup>322</sup>

According to the short recension of the Apocryphon he is placed over the first aeon with the great divine Autogenes Christ, in the first aeon with (CG III) or of (BG) Harmozel and his powers with him.<sup>323</sup> The version in CG II, perhaps aware of the evident contradiction of having Adam set over the first aeon in the first aeon, has Adam set over the first aeon with the great Autogenes Christ alongside the first luminary, Armozel, with his powers.<sup>324</sup> However, the evidence of Irenaeus' account would appear to suggest that CG II's version may be more original, and that the short recension has been confused by the combination of the aeon scheme with the luminary scheme. Thus it has Adamas separated with the first light from

Armoges (remotus est cum primo lumine ab Armoge).<sup>325</sup> Schmidt points out that Irenaeus is totally mistaken in having Adamas separated with the first light from Armoges/Harmozel since the first light is Armoges/Harmozel,<sup>326</sup> but since Irenaeus has already made this identification explicit, we must assume a mistake in the translation from the Greek here, perhaps centring on the participle remotus.<sup>327</sup>

The Apocryphon then relates how the invisible (BG 35,11 adds "Spirit") gave Adamas an invincible intellectual (νοερός) power,<sup>328</sup> which is echoed by Irenaeus' account which has the virginal Spirit give him an invincible power (virtutem ... invictam),<sup>329</sup> but prior to this the latter related the emanation by Autogenes along with Man of perfect Knowledge (Γνῶσις) as his consort, whereby man gained knowledge of the being who was above everything.<sup>330</sup> Later these two produce an offspring called lignum or Ξύλον, which (or who?) itself is named "Gnosis" (Γνῶσις / Gnosis).<sup>331</sup> The latter could, of course, be understood as an allegorical interpretation of the tree of knowledge or of the Cross, or both, similar to that used by Christian theologians of the second and third centuries like Irenaeus himself.<sup>332</sup> But there is no trace of this idea in the Apocryphon, and instead we suddenly hear of the heavenly Seth, the son of Adamas being set over the second aeon, with no indication of how he originated.<sup>333</sup> As we shall see, the Apocryphon in its present form appears to have been reworked to incorporate the independent tradition of heavenly Seth

and his immoveable race, the Sethians. This might explain the absence of the figure of heavenly Seth in Irenaeus' account of the Barbelognostics (and Ophites) and also the absence of the figure of "Tree/Gnosis" in the Apocryphon.

However, there is one final possible parallel between adv.haer. I 29 and the Apocryphon. The latter has Adamas honour and praise the invisible Spirit because everything originated on account of him and everything will return to him,<sup>334</sup> ending with the words: "Now I praise you and the Autogenes and the aeons, the three: the Father, the Mother, the Son, the perfect power".<sup>335</sup> According to Irenaeus' account all things (omnia) rest in the virginal Spirit, praising (hymnizare) the great Aeon. Hence (hinc), Irenaeus continues, there was manifested the Mother, Father, Son.<sup>336</sup> The last phrase would appear to refer to the supreme triad of Barbelo, the unnameable Father, and Christ the Son whose existence is revealed by this act of praise to the lower realms and to subsequent creatures, while the great Aeon probably designates the supreme being, the virginal Spirit.<sup>337</sup> In the case of the Apocryphon's doxology, which is ascribed to Adamas alone and not to all the heavenly world as in Irenaeus, Till<sup>338</sup> and Janssens<sup>339</sup> suggest that the reading in CG III 13,15, "the aeon" is to be preferred, since it would then refer to Barbelo and thus we would have the Barbelognostic triad of invisible Spirit or Father, Autogenes or Son/Christ, Aeon or Mother Barbelo. But the plural of BG 35,18



and CG II 9,10 may be preferable not only as the more difficult reading but also because it adds further support to the hypothesis advanced above, that the Apocryphon has combined with the more original figures of the Barbelognostic triad of Father, Mother Barbelo and Son Light (or Christ) and the four luminaries, an independent hierarchical scheme of supreme being, Autogenes and his four aeons, and Adamas. Thus we have clear evidence in, for example, the Gospel of the Egyptians, of the latter scheme alongside the triad of Father, Mother and Son and the motif of the four luminaries and their consorts.<sup>340</sup> In Zostrianos, too, we find doxologies to the Self-Begotten god (i.e. Autogenes), who is the source of the four spatio-temporal aeons, Geradamas (or Pigeradamas) his eye, and his son Seth.<sup>341</sup>

Finally, the fact that the Apocryphon adds to the mention of the three the epithet originally applied to Barbelo, viz. "the perfect power",<sup>342</sup> may suggest that the three names designate not the Barbelognostic triad so much as the figure of the Revealer/Redeemer of the prologue and revelation discourse, who proclaims himself the Father, the Mother and the Son.<sup>343</sup> This figure may be none other than Barbelo herself, the Protennoia of the Apocryphon and of the Trimorphic Protennoia, three yet one. This ascription of praise marks the conclusion of the first stage of the cosmogony; the completion of the heavenly world. But as Irenaeus' account spoke of the offspring of Adamas and Gnosis, so the Apocryphon, in a passage which



anticipates the future goal of the earthly offspring of heavenly Adamas and Seth, speaks of how Adamas' son Seth is set over the second aeon with the second luminary Oroiael, the seed ( σπέρμα ) of Seth, the holy souls, in the third aeon with the third luminary, Daueithe, and the souls of those who knew (short recension) or were ignorant of (long) their perfection but did not repent quickly but only eventually, in the fourth aeon with Eleleth.<sup>344</sup> We will discuss this passage in detail when we come to deal with the soteriology of the Apocryphon, and only wish to note the confusion in the versions over the relation of the aeons and the luminaries, which serves to confirm our hypothesis that two distinct traditions are here combined.<sup>345</sup> The evident hierarchical structure of the aeons which this passage suggests is plainly borne out by the similar conception in Zostrianos.<sup>346</sup> Finally, the fact that these beings praise the invisible Spirit may be an echo of the statement in Irenaeus' account that everything praised the great Aeon.<sup>347</sup>

### Conclusion

Our analysis of the Apocryphon's account of the heavenly cosmogony in the light of Irenaeus adv. haer. I 29 and related texts would suggest that in answer to the questions of the unity of the Apocryphon, as to which version is closest to the original and what is the precise relationship to Irenaeus adv. haer. I 29, the Apocryphon appears to

be a unity as regards the cosmogony, which may originally have been presented as a revelation discourse. But it also gives the appearance of being a compilation of traditions such as the description of the Monad, the self-revelation and unfolding of the supreme being, the four luminaries and their consorts etc. The latter two traditions occur in the Gospel of the Egyptians and tend to confirm the hypothesis that Irenaeus' account of the Barbelognostics reproduces a genuine Gnostic source which is closer to the tradition underlying the Apocryphon than the latter in its present form. Thus one cannot simply determine which version is more original independently of a comparison with Irenaeus. In such a comparison it would appear that the version in CG III is often closest to Irenaeus, while the long recension betrays a tendency to try to iron out inconsistencies, emphasize the role of the Pronoia and present a more spiritual interpretation. The copyist of CG II, however, appears to be more careless and prone to omissions than that of CG IV.

The chief differences between the Apocryphon and Irenaeus' account I have argued can frequently be best explained by the hypothesis that Irenaeus' account is closer to the original tradition or traditions and that the Apocryphon has diverged from them largely because it has failed to observe the original distinction between Barbelo (the Protennoia) and the Ennoia, and has fused the originally independent figures of the Light/Christ and Autogenes. This has also led it to

reinterpret figures like Truth, and break up the original system of paired male and female aeons. It has added traditions about the Autogenes and his four and twelve aeons to the distinct motif of the four luminaries and the Autogenes, and has given the basically Barbelognostic cosmogony a "Sethian" reworking.

The Apocryphon appears to represent a further stage of Christianization than Irenaeus' version in that it has identified Christ and Autogenes and has various echoes of and allusions to New Testament texts and ideas. None of the versions show much sign of systematic de-Christianization. And finally, as regards the question of influence on or from Valentinianism, in so far as the Apocryphon appears to have developed the tradition it shares with Irenaeus adv. haer. I 29 it may be said to reflect ideas which are parallel to and may well have influenced the development of Valentinian theology, e.g. the concept of the heavenly world as composed of the hypostatized mental states of the supreme being; the production of aeons from syzygies of male and female aeons; the figure of Sophia as last and furthest from the invisible Spirit.

Notes to Chapter 1

1. BG 19,6 - 22,17; CG II 1,1 - 2,26.
2. This latter is even more evident in the long recension which in Krause's reconstructions reads "The teaching [and words of the] Saviour and [he revealed] these mysteries which are hidden in silence [Jesus Christ] ". See Krause's edition pp.109,201.
3. BG 19,6 - 20,3; CG II 1,1-17. The version in CG II clearly preserves the proper reading  $\alpha\pi\lambda\alpha\nu\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon$  (1,9) over against the  $\alpha\lambda\alpha\nu\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon$  of BG 19,12.
4. Apocryphon, pp.152f.
5. BG 75, 7-10 and parr.
6. BG 20,3-19; CG II 1,17-29.
7. BG 20,19 - 21,13; CG II 1,30 - 2,9. Cf. Acta Petri chs. 20f.; PS Book I chs. 4f. (C.Schmidt - V. MacDermot, Pistis Sophia = Nag Hammadi Studies vol. IX, Leiden 1978; pp.7.5 - 8.23).
8. BG 21,14 - 22,5; CG II 2,9-18.
9. BG 22,8-17; CG II 2,19-25. Cf. BG 75,15-76,1; CG III 39, 14-18; CG II 31,28 - 32; CG IV 49,9-13.
10. Cf. BG 35,3ff. and parr.; 49,5ff. and parr.; 71,12ff. and parr. In Zostrianos (Zostr ) Adamas or Geradamas is the perfect man, cf. CG VIII 6,23ff.; 30,4f.
11. Cf. BG 65,2f. and parr.; CG III 36,24f.; BG 73,9f. and parr.; BG 75,20 - 76,1 and parr. However, among the texts where heavenly Seth plays a more central role, he is the Father of the immoveable race. Cf. GEgypt CG III 51,8f.; 59,13f.; 61,19f.; 3 StSeth CG VII, 118,12f.
12. BG 21,3-13; CG II 2,1-9.
13. Cf. CG II 30,11 - 31,25; TrimProt CG XIII 37,20-30; 42,4-27.
14. Cf. BG 27,13 - 28,4 and parr. where Barbelo is described as the perfect power and as the triple male, the triple powered, the triple named (i.e. Father, Mother, Son?). In BG 35,18-20

and parr., Adamas praises the three, the Father the Mother and the Son, the perfect power, which might suggest that Barbelo is the subject here.

15. Secret Books, p.211.
16. "Ireneus and the Gnostics", Viq. Chr. 30 (1976), p.200.
17. Adv. haer. I 29,1 (Harvey I 222). But this may not necessarily be Christian. The Light gets his name because he was anointed (unxisse:  $\chi\rho\iota\epsilon\iota\nu$ ?) with the goodness (benignitate:  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$ ?) of the Father. Cf. AJ BG 30,14-19 and parr. The holy Spirit is also mentioned at I 29,4 (Harvey I 225) but it too need not necessarily be seen as the consequence of Christian influence.
18. BG 22,17-19; CG II 2,26f.; CG IV 3,24f. Krause's suggestion to read  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omicron\upsilon$  at BG 22,17f. instead of the  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\pi\epsilon\tau\eta\eta$  of Till is justified in the light of the  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omicron\upsilon$  of CG II 2,26, but Giversen's  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\epsilon\pi\omicron\upsilon$  is better still in that Krause omits the necessary  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\epsilon$  and fails to note that a masculine noun is required by the resumptive  $\epsilon\lambda\omega\alpha$  of BG 22,19. The Valentinian system described by Hippolytus has the monad ( $\eta\ \mu\omicron\nu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ ) described as "Father" (Ref. VI 29,2; Wendland 155.22-25).
19. BG 22,17 - 26,19; CG II 2,26 - 4,21; CG IV 3,24 - 6,24. The parallel in CG III (5,1 - 7,5) begins halfway through.
20. BG 22,20f.; CG II 2,28f.; CG IV 3,26f.
21. BG 23,4; 24,6f; CG III 5,2f.; CG II 3,17; CG IV 4,28-5,2; BG 25,22; CG III 6,13.
22. BG 24,9 - 25,7; CG III 5,5-23; CG II 3,20-35; CG IV 5,4-23.
23. Cf. Allog CG XI. 62, 28-63, 25 (NB the Facsimile Edition of Codices XI, XII and XIII numbers pp. 63-78 of Codex XI by two too many. See the introduction, p. XIII). However, the Allogenes passage reverses the order of perfection and divinity and has certain additional material of its own.
24. Cf. adv. haer. I 29,1 (Harvey I 222f.).
25. Cf. BG 24,4 and parr. (nameless) and references in n.21 (Light).

26. Cf. adv.haer. I 30,1 (Harvey I 226f.).
27. On immeasurable, incorruptible light cf. BG 24,6ff. and parr.; on him as blessed cf. BG 25,16 and parr.; on the Father of everything or of the All cf. BG 22,20 and parr. The term is a common Gnostic title for the supreme being cf. e.g. Eugnostos the Blessed (Eug) CG III 73,2f.; Gospel of Philip (GPh) CG II 71,4; Hypostasis of the Archons (NatArch) CG II 88,11; 96,12; 97,15f.; Gospel of Truth (GTr) CG I 43,4f. etc.
28. Adv.haer. I 30,1 (Harvey I 226f.).
29. Cf. adv.haer. I 1,1 (Harvey I 8f.) on Bythus, and I 12,3 (Harvey I 113f.) on Man as the supreme power among some Valentinians. Cf. Epiph Pan.XXXI, 5,5 (Holl 1,391.6f.).
30. TriTrac CG I 51,1 - 55,40.
31. Eug CG III 71,13 - 73,3. On the relation between the two, cf. M. Krause "Das literarische Verhältnis des Eugnostosbriefes zur Sophia Jesu Christi: zur Auseinandersetzung der Gnosis mit dem Christentum", Mullus: Festschrift Theodor Klauser (JbAC Ergänzungsband 1, Münster 1964), pp.215-23, reversing the arguments of H.-M. Schenke in "Nag-Hamadi Studien II: Das System der Sophia Jesu Christi", ZRGG 14 (1962), pp.263-78, who argues that Eugnostos derives from the SJC. See Wilson, Gnosis, pp. 111-117.
32. Ref. VII 20,2 - 21,1 (Wendland 195.24 - 196.22). Irenaeus' account in adv.haer. I 24,3-7 (Harvey I 198-203), which belongs to the heresiological list in Book I (23,1 - 28,2), which itself probably goes back to Justin's lost Syntagma (cf. e.g. Wisse, "The Nag Hammadi Library", Vig.Chr. 25 (1971), p.213), simply speaks of the unoriginate and ineffable or nameless Father (innatum .... et innominatum Patrem).
33. On this see R.M. Grant, The Early Christian Doctrine of God, Charlottesville, Virginia, 1966, pp.14-28.
34. Cf. TriTrac CG I 51,1-16. Line 15 speaks of the unique one ( $\pi\omicron\upsilon\epsilon\ \bar{\nu}\omicron\gamma\omega\tau$ ) which recalls Giversen's suggestion for BG 22,20. Cf. also Hipp. Ref. VI 29,2 (Wendland 155.22-25), and the beginning of the Gospel of the Egyptians (CG III 40,12 - 41,7).
35. Cf. Krause, art.cit., p.222.

36. Eug CG III 70,1 - 73,3.
37. SJC BG 77,9 - 80,4. cf. ~~AT~~ BG 20,3 - 22,17 and parr.
38. Apocryphon, p.161.
39. Ref. VI 29,2 (Wendland, 155, 22f.).
40. Cf. Crum, Coptic Dictionary, Oxford 1939, 758b (s.v.  $\Sigma\omega$ ); 759a ( $\Upsilon\epsilon\tau\tau\iota\lambda\alpha\lambda\alpha$ ).
41. Cf. e.g. CG II 2,29.33; 5,28.31.33f. 35-6.1; 6,4. 11f. 19.35; 7,5.14 etc. and parr. See the index in Krause's edition s.v.  $\alpha\delta\rho\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$  and in Till's s.v.  $\pi\nu\epsilon\theta\mu\alpha$ .
42. Cf. CG II 6,29.31; CG IV 10,10; CG II 7,16; CG IV 11,7; CG II 8,27f.
43. Cf. BG 46,19; CG III 21,5. Both of these speak of the holy invisible Spirit, recalling BG 22,20f.
44. The Nag Hammadi Library, p.100.
45. BG 24,9 - 25,7; CG III 5,5-23; CG II 3,20-35; CG IV 5,4-22.
46. CG XI 62 [64], 28-63 [65], 25.
47. CG XI 63,1-5. However, there are slight differences and CG XI 63,1f. has the  $\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon\ldots\omicron\upsilon\tau\epsilon$  of the long recension rather than the  $\omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\ldots\omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon$  of BG.
48. Cf. BG 24,6f.; CG III 5,2f. and CG II 3,17; CG IV 4,28 - 5,1.
49. CG II 4,1-10 and parr.
50. BG 25,14f.; CG III 6,6f.
51. BG 25,22; CG III 6,13.
52. CG II 4,8-10; CG IV 6,6-9.
53. Apocryphon, p.164.
54. BG 26,1-4; CG III 6,13-16.
55. CG II 4,10; CG IV 6,9f.



56. Apocryphon, p.164.
57. See the note to BG 26,5f. on p.93 of his edition.
58. BG 26,11-14; CG III 6,24 - 7,1; CG II 4,15-18; CG IV 6,16-19.  
The [ΠΕΝΤ]ΔΥΩΝΙΣ ΕΒΘΑ of CG II 4,17 is an evident misreading of the ΠΕΝΤΔΥΩΝΙΣ of the short recension and CG IV.
59. BG 26,14-19; CG III 7,1-5.
60. Cf. Hardy's translation of BG in R.M. Grant (ed.), Gnosticism: An Anthology, London 1961, p.71, and Krause's translation of BG in W. Foerster (ed.) Gnosis, vol. I p.108. See also Y. Janssens, "L'Apocryphon", Muséon 83 (1970), p.165.
61. CG II 4,18; CG IV 6,19.
62. BG 22,20 and parr.
63. CG II 4,19f.; CG IV 6,20-22.
64. Cf. Janssens, art.cit., p.165.
65. Ibid.
66. Cf. Allog CG XI 61[63],23 - 67[69],39.
67. BG 26,6-9 and parr. On the primal silence of the supreme being cf. Ign. Magn. 8:2; Valentinians in Iren. adv. haer I 1,1 (Harvey I 8): GEgypt CG III 40,17f. = IV 50,7-9 etc.
68. BG 26,19 - 27,1; CG III 7,6-9; CG II 4,21f.; CG IV 6,23-5.  
The long recension omits the reference to the aeon's worlds.
69. BG 26,15ff. and parr.
70. Janssens, Muséon 84 (1971), p.43. She refers to fragment 17 of Heracleon. See W. Völker, Quellen zur Geschichte der christlichen Gnosis, Tübingen 1932, p.71, ll.13-15.22-26.
71. BG 27,1-4; CG III 7,9-12. CG III 7,9 omits the verb. Cf. C.H. I 14.



72. BG 27,4-8; CG III 7,12-15; CG II 4,26-29; CG IV 7,1-5.
73. BG 27,9 (ΠΤΗΡΩ = τὸ πᾶν ); CG III 7,16 (ἸΝΚΑ ΝΙΜ = πᾶντες ); CG II 4,30 (ΤΗΡΟΥ = πᾶντες ?); CG IV 7,6 ( ΤΗ[ΡΟΥ] ). CG IV 7,5 reads: "the first power", but the qualification is redundant.
74. BG 27,9f. CG II 4,31 and CG IV 7,6 appear to read: "who appeared in his thought", which does not make much sense, while CG III 7,16 omits it.
75. CG III 7,16f. BG 27,10f. reads: "the perfect Pronoia of the All", while CG II 4,32 has a lacuna and CG IV 7 has several lines missing.
76. BG 27,11-13; CG III 7,17f.; CG II 4,32-35. BG has omitted the verb ΕΤΡΟΥΘΕΙΝ through homoeoteleuton, while CG II has included a later phrase ("the perfect power") before mention of the image of the invisible. CG III differs from the other two and may represent a misunderstanding or abbreviation. Its reference to the Pronoia glowing in the light of the image seems nonsense since the Pronoia is the image.
77. BG 27,13f.; CG III 7,18f.; CG II 4,33f.
78. BG 27,14f.; CG III 7,19f. On the proposed etymologies of Barbelo see Giversen, Apocryphon, pp.165f.; A.Böhlig - F.Wisse; Nag Hammadi Codices III,2 and IV,2: The Gospel of the Egyptians (Nag Hammadi Studies IV), Leiden 1975,p.40.
79. CG II 4,34f.
80. BG 27,15-17; CG III 7,20f.; CG II 5,3f.
81. BG 27,18f. = CG III 7,22f. ( ΖΟΥΙΤΕ ἸΕΝΝΟΙΑ ); CG II 5,4 ( ΩΟΥΤ ἸΜΕΟΥΕ ). This designation clearly corresponds to the title of the subject of the Trimorphic Protennoia. In it she (ΤΠΡΩΤΕΝΝΟΙΑ) is identified as Barbelo, the perfect glory, the Father of all aeons.. the image of the invisible spirit. Cf. CG XIII 38,7-11.
82. CG II 5,5-7; CG IV 7,20-2. Μητροπάτωρ is clearly not to be translated "Grossvater" as Krause does. Cf. the attribute Μητὴρ-πατὴρ applied to the supreme power of the Simonian system in Hipp. Ref. VI 17,3 (Wendland 143.11) and the address to the bisexual Adamas of the Naassene Preaching as 'Father

.... Mother' in Hipp. Ref. V 6,5 (Wendland 78.10).  
 ⲙⲁⲧⲉⲣⲏⲧⲁⲣⲏ only occurs in the long recension, although BG 75,11 = CG III 39,11f. have the Coptic ⲙⲁⲁⲩⲩ ⲛⲉⲩⲱⲧ which would appear to mean "Father - Mother". Certainly this figure has the attribute ("rich in mercy") of the Metro-pator in the long recension. Cf. CG II 19, 17; 20,9f.; 27,33f. Here and in CG II 6,16 and 14,19 the title appears to refer to Barbelo, according to Giversen (*Apocryphon*, p.168), whereas in the three other cases (CG II 19,17; 20,9f.; 27,33f.) it signifies the Primordial Father. However, he notes the ambivalence of the title: as an emanation from him Barbelo can also have his title. As we shall see, however, even in the latter three cases it may be Barbelo too who is the subject. The only other use of the term occurs in Irenaeus' and Tertullian's account of Valentinianism where it is a title of the Demiurge expressing the nature of his creative activity. Cf. Iren. adv. haer. I 5,1 (Harvey I 42); Tert. adv. Val. 18 (Kroymann, CSEL 47,197.16).

83. TrimProt CG XIII 38,13,15. Cf. 45,3 which has been reconstructed by the translator J.D. Turner to read "[I am both Mother and] Father" (*Nag Hammadi Library*, p.467.).
84. Adv. haer. I 1,1 (Harvey I 9).
85. BG 27,19f.; CG III 7,23f.
86. BG 27,19 - 28,5; CG III 7,23 - 8,5.
87. CG II 5,5-11; CG IV 7,20-27.
88. CG XIII 37,20-7. Cf. 35,6.
89. Adv. haer. I 29,1 (Harvey I 222).
90. Cf. CG II 4,35.
91. Cf. CG II 5,11-13; CG IV 7,27-9.
92. Cf. CG II 5,17f.; 6,19; 7,19.23; 8,34; 14,4f.; 31,12f. and parr. Usually, but not always, the qualifications "invisible" and "great" are added. Cf. GEgypt CG III 44,12; 49,24; 53,17f.; 55,20f.; 61,25; 65,11 and parr.
93. Cf. BG 37,5 and par., where the term is qualified by "male".

94. Cf. BG 32,7 and par. BG 30,20f. and par. is more ambiguous and could refer to Barbelo, but probably also designates the supreme being.
95. Adv. haer. I 29,1 (Harvey I 222).
96. The identification of the virginal spirit of Irenaeus' account with the supreme being is confirmed by I 29,3 (Harvey I 224) where the virginal spirit who gives Adam invincible power is clearly the same as the invisible spirit of BG 35,10-13 and parr.
97. Theodoret, however, identifies the Ennoia with Barbelo.
98. I 30,1 (Harvey I 227).
99. The Latin text uses progredientem, which recalls the progressam/ προελαύουσα of I 29,1 (Harvey I 222) and CG III 8,5 which Krause reconstructs as [προ]ελαθε.
100. Epiph. Pan. XXXI 5,3 (Holl 1,390.10-12). The letter goes on to speak of the Ennoia within this aeon.
101. See n.88.
102. Cf. BG 21,19-21; CG II 2,13-15; CG IV 3,6-8.
103. Cf. CG II 30,11 - 31,25; CG IV 46,23 - 49,6.
104. BG 35,13-20 and parr.
105. Till in a footnote ad.loc. takes the singular "aeon" of CG III 13,15 to refer to the Mother, Barbelo, but failed to see the significance of the phrase "the perfect power" and was of course unaware of the support for the plural "aeons" in CG II 9,10.
106. See The Books of Jeu and the Untitled Text in the Bruce Codex (ed. C. Schmidt, trans. V. MacDermot = Nag Hammadi Studies vol. XIII), Leiden 1978, p.231.7-16. However, as Giversen notes (Apocryphon, p.169), this is said not of Barbelo but of μενογαυή.
107. GEgypt CG III 41,7-12; CG IV 50,23 - 51,2.
108. CG III 41,23 - 42,13; CG IV 51,15 - 52,5.
109. BG 28,3f.; CG III 8,4f. Cf. BG 27,10f.; CG III 7,16f.

110. CG II 5,11 and CG IV 7,26f. may have omitted mention of  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$  because they were aware of the awkwardness of the reference.
111. The Gospel of the Egyptians, p.170.
112. Just such an original triad of Father, Mother, and Son appears to underlie the Three Steles of Seth (3StSeth) of Codex VII (CG VII,5). But in it we also find the idea that the Mother, the first aeon, Barbelo, is herself triple, a triple power. Cf. CG VII 121,20-5; 122,10-13; 123,6-26. The Son, Adamas, is also described as triple male. Cf. 120,29f. etc.
113. Art.cit., p.44.
114. Ibid., pp.44f.
115. Ibid., p.45.
116. BG 28,4-7; CG III 8,5-7.
117. CG III 8,6 unfortunately has a lacuna which Krause reconstructs [ε-τ Ν Δ C] . Till in the note to BG 28,6 suggests reading **NΔC** , but such an emendation is not necessary since the sense is reasonably clear.
118. CG II 5,11-14; CG IV 7,27- 8,1.
119. Giversen (Apocryphon p.169) also sees that "Barbelo" cannot designate the invisible spirit despite the fact that it does so grammatically, and he attempts to link it with the previous masculine expression, "the first to come forth", which also governs the masculine prefix of the verb (ἀ-).
120. CG II 5,13. CG IV 7,29 unfortunately breaks off just before the final letter.
121. The long recension might be felt to support Mlle Janssen's argument since it apparently distinguishes between First Man and Barbelo. But it breaks the connection between the verb ("he became") and the object "a First Man", omits to mention that he is from the Father's  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$  , and in this passage clearly represents a misunderstanding of the original situation which had Barbelo as the subject.
122. Art.cit., pp.45-6.

123. BG 28,4-7; CG III 8,5-7; CG II 5,11-14; CG IV 7,27 - 8,1. The short recension uses  $\omega\rho\pi \bar{\nu}\epsilon\theta\epsilon\gamma\bar{\nu}$  here but varies between it and  $\pi\rho\epsilon\gamma\omega\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ . Cf. BG 28,8; 34,19; 36,19; CG III 8,8f.17; 9,7; 12,24f.; 14,12, which have the former and BG 28,18; 31,20; CG III 10,24f., which have the latter. The long recension consistently reads  $\pi\rho\epsilon\gamma\omega\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ , a characteristic of later Coptic translation from the Greek according to Kasser, Muséon 77 (1964), pp.6f.
124. Cf. Theodoret haer. fab. comp. I 13 (Migne PG 83 361C) and Iren. adv. haer. I 29,1 (Harvey I 222).
125. BG 28,7; CG III 8, 7f.; CG II 5,14; CG IV 8,1. The short recension has  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ , the long  $\epsilon\iota\omega\rho\mu$ , which is a form of  $\Sigma\omega\rho\mu$  (Crum, Coptic Dictionary, 785b), and which must be distinguished from the entirely separate verb meaning "stare" (Crum, Dictionary, 84ab). Although Krause (Drei Versionen p.260) makes this distinction, Giversen (Apocryphon p.111) does not.
126. BG 28,7-10; CG III 8,8-10.
127. CG II 5,14-18; CG IV 8,2-7. Giversen (Apocryphon p.170) is clearly wrong to identify the thought and the Pronoia.  
 $\epsilon\varsigma\sigma\alpha\lambda \bar{\nu}\bar{\nu}$  means not "one with" but "one from".
128. Cf. BG 27,5-18 and par.
129. CG II 4,29-32; CG IV 7,5-7.
130. Cf. CG II 5,4.24: 6,6; 7,4 and BG 27,18; 29,12; 31,11 and par.
131. CG II 5,4.
132. Cf. CG II 5,24. But again in CG II 6,5f. the Thought ( $\mu\epsilon\epsilon\rho\epsilon$ ) appears to be distinguished from the Pronoia who is Barbelo. Cf. Janssens, art.cit., p.47.
133. Cf. CG II 6,5f. Whether Giversen is correct to identify Barbelo, Pronoia and Ennoia as the first member of the pentad and Truth as the original fifth (Apocryphon p.171) will be discussed below.

134. BG 28,10-13; CG III 8,11-13; CG II 5,18-20; CG IV 8,7f. As Till notes (ad loc.) both BG 28,10 and CG III 8,1 have the feminine form of verbal prefix despite having a masculine subject. He suggests the scribes were affected by the preceding  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\nu\omicron\iota\alpha$ . Giversen is probably right to see here a constructio ad sensum in the light of the underlying Greek  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\gamma\gamma\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$  (Apocryphon p.170 n.1). Till (p.298) also appeals to the plural form  $\delta\gamma\omega\gamma\omega\pi\epsilon$  in BG 28,13 as support for his argument that the Apocryphon originally had 2 Ennoia figures. The "they originated" of BG must refer to the (second) Ennoia and Prognosis. But as he admits, the switch between  $\delta\gamma$ - and  $\delta\epsilon$ - is an easy one and the corresponding passage in CG III 8,13 has the singular  $\nu\tau\alpha\gamma\omega\pi\epsilon$ . See Giversen, Apocryphon, pp.170f.
135. BG 28,13-21; CG III 8,13-20; CG II 5,20-6. Giversen, although attacking Till's first argument for two Ennoia (on p.298), namely that in BG the pattern of praise is that the (second) Ennoia and Prognosis praise the Invisible and Barbelo, then the Ennoia, Prognosis and Imperishability do the same, on the grounds that in BG 28,10 and 19 the MS has the singular form of the verb, fails to note that in the parallels to the latter (CG III 8,18f. and CG II 5,24-26) the verbs are in the plural. See also following note.
136. BG 28,21-29,6; CG III 8,20 - 9,3; CG II 5,26-32; CG IV 8,20-4. The long recension adds a reference to Barbelo as the subject to remove any doubts since she has previously not been identified directly. Again in this case Giversen has failed to note that in all four texts plural verbs are used (apart from CG III 8,23f.) suggesting that the figure of Ennoia is indeed to be distinguished from Barbelo. The ambiguous evidence in the first instance may be due to the attempts by redactors to carry through the identification of the Ennoia and Barbelo. In the later cases their vigilance may have relaxed. Janssens' attempt to distinguish the emanation of the first two as from (  $\epsilon\beta\omicron\lambda\ \nu\iota\tau\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon$  ) Barbelo and therefore more directly, and the latter two for (  $\epsilon\tau\omicron\beta\eta\eta\tau\epsilon$  ) her, on the basis of BG, falls down on the fact that CG III 8,19 reads  $\epsilon\beta\omicron\lambda\ \nu\iota\tau\omicron\sigma\tau\epsilon$  of the third aeon. Further, all together in BG 29,6 praise Barbelo because they originated for (  $\epsilon\tau\omicron\beta\eta\eta\tau\epsilon$  ) her.
137. BG 29,7f.; CG III 9,1-3.



138. BG 29,8f.; CG III 9,3f. CG II 6,8 has  $\pi\epsilon\nu\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  which is preferable. Cf. the Untitled Text of the Bruce Codex, ch.15 (Schmidt-MacDermot p.255.24).
139. BG 29,9-18; CG III 9,4-10. BG 29,17f. reads : "(the Father) of the unbegotten ( $\xi\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ ) Father", which clearly is nonsense and may, as Janssens suggests (art.cit., p.48), be explained as resulting from the incorporation of a marginal note.
140. CG II 5,32-4; CG IV 8,24-7.
141. CG II 5,35- 6,2; CG IV 8,27-9.
142. Although the plural prefix  $\lambda\gamma-$  is attested in both CG II 5,35 and CG IV 8,27.
143. CG II 6,2-10; CG IV 9,8-11.
144. Cf. BG 29,12-16; CG III 9,6-8 where Barbelo and Ennoia are separated off from each other by the same copula ( $\mu\tilde{\nu}$ ) as separates each in the list.
145. BG 27,4-7; CG III 7, 12-14; CG II 4,26-9; CG IV 8,1-4.
146. Adv.haer. I 29,1 (Harvey I 222).
147. BG 27,15-17 and parr.
148. Cf. BG 28,5f.; CG III 8,6.
149. Cf. CG II 5,11-14; CG IV 7,27 - 8,1. See p.56.
150. Adv.haer. I 29,1 (Harvey I 222). But cf. Theodoret haer.fab.comp. I,13 (PG 83 361C) which has the singular form  $\alpha\tilde{\nu}\theta\iota\varsigma$   $\alpha\tilde{\iota}\tau\eta\sigma\acute{\alpha}\sigma\eta\varsigma$  which could refer either to Prognosis, or to Ennoia. The  $\alpha\tilde{\nu}\theta\iota\varsigma$  (cf. BG 28,13;  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\nu$ ) might suggest the latter.
151. Adv.haer. I 29,1 (Harvey 223). Cf. BG 32,1ff. and parr.
152. GEgypt CG III 41,7-12 = CG IV 50,23 - 51,2; CG III 41,23 - 42,11 = CG IV 51,15 - 52,2.
153. GEgypt CG III 42,5-11; CG IV 51,22 - 52,2. Cf. Iren. adv.haer. I 29,1 (Harvey I 222f.); AJ BG 31,5-18 and parr.

154. Adv. haer. I 29,2 (Harvey I 223).
155. Cf. AJ BG 30,4-9; CG III 9,15-19; BG 32,8-14; CG III 11,6-11; CG II 7,15-24 and Iren. adv. haer. I 29,1f. (Harvey I 222f.). See below.
156. Cf. AJ BG 32,14-18; CG III 11,12f.; CG II 7,25-7; CG IV 11, 18-22. This represents an evident distortion of Iren. adv. haer. I 29,2 (Harvey I 223: et omnia huic subjecta. Coëmissam autem ei Alethiam).
157. Apocryphon, p.171.
158. "Nag-Hamadi Studien III: Die Spitze des dem Apokryphon Johannis und der Sophia Jesu Christi zugrundeliegenden gnostischen Systems", ZRGG 14(1962), p.359.
159. *Ibid.*
160. BG 27,19f.; CG III 7,23f.
161. Adv. haer. I 29,1 (Harvey I 222).
162. *Ibid.*
163. Cf. GEgypt CG III 42,5-11; CG IV 51,22 - 52,2 and Iren. adv. haer. I 29,1 (Harvey I 222f.). They are of course not paired as in Irenaeus' account.
164. The omission of a masculine noun between ἀφθαρσίᾳ and eternal life (feminine in Greek) breaks up the pattern of female/male and the order in Irenaeus' account, suggesting that Christ (or the Light) was originally present at that point in the list.
165. So Giversen, Apocryphon, p.172.
166. CG II 6,10-15; CG IV 9,11-18.
167. BG 29,18 - 30,4; CG III 9,10-15. BG 29,20 has mistakenly identified Barbelo as the pure light, which is the attribute of the Supreme Father, cf. BG 24,6f. and parr. Further, BG 30,2 has omitted the mention of the light being like the blessed light (CG III 9,13f.) through homoeoteleuton.



168. Adv. haer. I 29,1 (Harvey I 222). The translation of the last phrase (in hanc ....) by Krause/Wilson in Gnosis, vol I, p.104, makes the Father generate in her a light like her. But surely in hanc cannot mean "in her", which ought to be in hac. Theodoret (haer. fab. comp. I 13: PG 83 361 C) assumes that Barbelo is the subject and that she bears the light. Harvey assumes that in hanc refers to the magnitudo and that it renders an original  $\epsilon\pi\iota\tau\epsilon\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$  (I 222f. n.3). Certainly Barbelo is then said to have been the beginning or originator of the illumination and generation (generationis) of all things. In any case Irenaeus' account agrees with the short recension in having her look at the supreme being, and generation is surely more appropriate to her as a subordinate female (or androgynous?) being than him who has previously merely emanated aeons.
169. Adv. haer. I 29,1 (Harvey I 222): conceptu delectatam. Cf. Theodoret haer. fab. comp. I 13 (PG 83 361 C):  $\epsilon\gamma\kappa\epsilon\upsilon\mu\omicron\nu\gamma\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ . The  $\alpha\varsigma[k]\omicron\tau\epsilon\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\gamma\eta\epsilon\rho\omicron\gamma$  of BG 30,1 and  $\alpha\varsigma\tau\kappa\alpha\tau\omicron\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\gamma\eta\epsilon\rho\omicron\gamma$  of CG III 9,12 may reflect a misunderstanding of the Greek  $\sigma\upsilon\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu\beta\alpha\iota\nu$ , which the long recension has properly rendered by  $\alpha\kappa\alpha\epsilon\sigma\gamma\omega$  (CG II 6,12; CG IV 9,15). One of the Coptic renderings of  $\sigma\upsilon\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}\mu\beta\alpha\iota\nu$  in its metaphorical sense ("understand") is  $\kappa\alpha\uparrow$  (Crum, Dictionary 123a). The original Coptic translators may have used  $\kappa\alpha\uparrow$  which was then changed into the more common  $\kappa\omega\tau\epsilon$ . Cf. the presentation of Achamoth as overjoyed at the vision of the lights or angels who accompanied the Saviour, and becoming pregnant and giving birth to spiritual offspring, by the Ptolemean school of Valentinianism in Iren. adv. haer. I 4,5 (Harvey I 41). Thus the long recension's version, which has the Father look at Barbelo, may not be original as Giversen argues (Apocryphon p.172), but a further piece of spiritualisation on its part.
170. The copyist may have misread an original  $\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\eta\epsilon$   $\overline{\mu\mu\eta\tau\mu\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma}$   $\overline{\nu\omicron\gamma\omicron\epsilon\iota\eta\epsilon}$  (in a likeness of light-blessedness) as  $\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\eta\epsilon$   $\overline{\mu\mu\eta\tau\mu\alpha\kappa\alpha\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma}$   $\overline{\nu\epsilon\iota\eta\epsilon}$  as in CG II 6,13f. BG 30,3 has the light unequal to Barbelo, but this may be the consequence of its omission of the likeness idea.
171. Cf. e.g. Eug CG III 75,10-12. In Irenaeus' account of the Ptolemean system the Monogenes (who is also Nous) is both like and equal to him who produced him (adv. haer. I 1,1: Harvey I 9). But this is unique and applies to him alone, since he alone thereby comprehends the Father.

172. BG 30,4f.; CG III 9,15; CG II 6,15f.; CG IV 9,18f. The short recension has  $\mu\omicron\upsilon\theta\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$ , the long a Coptic equivalent,  $\omega\bar{\rho}\theta\gamma\omega\tau$ . Cf. Crum, Dictionary 585a. For a discussion of the sense see Janssens, art.cit., pp.52-54.
173. BG 30,5-9; CG III 9,16-19. BG 30,7-9 has "of the Spirit of pure light". As Till notes (ad loc.) CG III certainly has the better reading here. BG's reading  $\alpha\bar{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\tau\omicron\varsigma$  (30,6; 34,15) would appear to be a synonym of  $\alpha\bar{\upsilon}\tau\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$ . It occurs in the Untitled Text of the Bruce Codex (Schmidt-MacDermot 226.10; 275.16) as Janssens (art.cit., p.54) notes, referring to the supreme being.
174. CG II 6,16-18; CG IV 9,19-23. CG II 6,17 reads "i.e. the head" before the mention of the self- or only-begotten ( $\pi\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\theta\gamma\acute{\alpha}\delta\delta(\tau)\gamma$ ). In view of the usage of the short recension at this point, the former seems a better translation.
175. Cf. CG II 5,6f.
176. Cf. Iren. adv.haer. I 29 1-2 (Harvey I 222f.); GEgypt CG IV 59, 13 - 60,11.
177. Iren. adv.haer. I 29,1 (Harvey I 222).
178. BG 30,9-14; CG III 9,19-23; CG II 6,18-22; CG IV 9,23-28. The long recension adds "virginal" to its description of the Spirit and CG IV 9,27 has  $\epsilon\beta\omicron\lambda\ \bar{\lambda}\bar{\nu}$ , "out of" rather than  $\bar{\lambda}\bar{\nu}$  "through", as in the other texts, perhaps through dittography.
179. BG 30,15 (  $\bar{m}\bar{n}\bar{\tau}\bar{x}\bar{\varsigma}$  ); CG III 9,24 (  $\bar{m}\bar{n}\bar{\tau}\bar{x}\bar{\rho}\bar{\varsigma}$  ); CG II 6,23 (  $\bar{m}\bar{n}\bar{\tau}\bar{x}\bar{\rho}\bar{\varsigma} + \bar{n}\bar{\tau}\bar{h}\gamma$  ).
180. BG 30,17 (  $\bar{n}\bar{x}\bar{\varsigma}$  ); CG III 10,2 (  $\bar{n}\bar{x}\bar{\rho}\bar{\varsigma}$  ). CG II 6,24 links the being free of deficiency with the goodness (  $\bar{m}\bar{n}\bar{\tau}[\bar{x}]\bar{\rho}[\bar{\varsigma}]$  ).
181. BG 30,18 (  $\bar{m}\bar{n}\bar{\tau}\bar{x}\bar{\varsigma}$  ); CG III 10,3 (  $[\bar{m}]\bar{n}\bar{\tau}\bar{x}\bar{\rho}\bar{h}\bar{\varsigma}\bar{\tau}\bar{o}\bar{\varsigma}$  ); CG II 6,26 (  $[\bar{m}]\bar{n}[\bar{\tau}\bar{x}\bar{\rho}]\bar{\varsigma}$  ).
182. BG 30,14-19; CG III 9,24 - 10,4; CG II 6,23-6.
183. Adv.haer. I 29,1 (Harvey I 222): et videntem Patrem lumen hoc, unxisse illud sua benignitate, ut perfectum fieret. Hunc autem dicunt esse Christum. Cf. Theodoret haer.fab.comp. I 13 (PG 83 361 D - 364 A)  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\ \phi\alpha\tau\iota$ ,  $\tau\bar{\eta}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\bar{\nu}\omicron\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$   $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\omicron\tau\eta\tau\iota$ ,  $\acute{o}\nu\theta\mu\alpha\sigma\theta\eta\nu\alpha\iota\ \chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\nu$ .

184. Cf. GEgypt CG III 44,22-24; CG IV 55,12-14. The Trimorphic Protennoia also appears to speak of Christ being anointed, cf. TrimProt CG XIII 37,30-3. In both these cases the same verb is used (ⲧⲁⲗⲥ ) as in the Apocryphon and the latter may have had Christ being anointed with goodness. The first three letters of a substantive (ⲙⲛⲧ-) are preserved in CG XIII 37,33, and the translator of the text in The Nag Hammadi Library in English, J.D. Turner, restores the word [goodness] on p.463.
185. On p.40 of his edition of BG.
186. Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel aus Codex II von Nag Hammadi im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo (ed. A. Böhlig - P. Labib. Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin. Institut für Orientforschung, Nr.58), Berlin 1970, p.46.
187. Art.cit., pp.49-51.
188. Ibid., pp.49f.
189. Cf. Vita Claudii XXV 4. See also Justin I Apol. 4; Tertullian Apol. 3.5; Lactantius Inst. IV 7,5; Arndt-Gingrich-Bauer; A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament, Chicago 1957, p.854 s.v. Χριστός.
190. Art.cit., p.51.
191. Ibid.
192. The redactor of BG may have copied the pronominal prefix ⲧⲉ- recalling its use three lines before (30,15), and thus been forced to change the ⲛ of the genitive, which was now meaningless, to ⲉ-. Alternatively he may have felt the awkwardness of the reference to the invisible Spirit who is the subject of the sentence and yet is treated as if he were not.
193. Gnosis, p.107.
194. Ibid., pp.107f.
195. S. Arai, "Zur Christologie des Apokryphons des Johannes", NTS 15 (1968/69), p.305, would see this passage as a Gnostic interpretation of Jesus' baptism (Mk. 1: 9-10 and parr.), but the resemblances are not close, and the latter does not explain the title, "Christ".

196. Cf. e.g. GEgypt CG III 44,22ff.; CG IV 55,12ff.; 59,14-17; 60,7-11.
197. The Gospel of the Egyptians, p.46.
198. Cf. TrimProt CG XIII 37,3-20 on the descent and revelatory action of the Perfect Son, and 37,31 - 39,13 on his origin, anointing, self-revelation to his aeons etc. The title "Christ" ( $\pi\epsilon\chi\tau\epsilon$ ), occurs at 38,22 and 39,6f. Cf. 49,8.
199. Art.cit., p.305.
200. Cf. the description of the Son in TrimProt CG XIII 37,3-20 as Light (37,7f.) as well as Word. Cf. John 1: 1-9.
201. BG 30,19 - 31,5; CG III 10,4-9. The  $\text{NT}\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\omega\tau\epsilon\text{ } \text{N}\alpha\gamma\epsilon\beta\epsilon\alpha$  of BG 30,19, despite Janssens' brave attempts to defend it as equivalent to the  $\epsilon\gamma\omega\gamma\epsilon\epsilon\omega\gamma$  of CG II 6,27f., does not mean "which he poured for him" since  $\epsilon\gamma\omega\tau\epsilon + \text{N}$  means to pour in according to Crum, Dictionary 498a, and since the antecedent is the supreme being. Thus it is best with Till to emend to  $\text{NT}\alpha\gamma\epsilon\gamma\omega\text{N}\epsilon$  since the parallel at CG III 10,4 has  $\text{N}\alpha\gamma\epsilon\beta\epsilon\alpha$ . The 'virginal Spirit' would appear to denote the supreme being here, since it does the anointing. See n.94.
202. CG II 6,26-33; CG IV 10,7-12. Here "holy Spirit" evidently applies to the supreme being and not Barbelo as in CG II 5,7f. Grammatically it would be very odd for the subject of the main verb ("he stood") to be different from that of the circumstantial ("pouring") as Wisse's translation (Nag Hammadi Library p.102) suggests.
203. BG 31,5-9; CG III 10,9-14; CG II 6,33 - 7,3; CG IV 10,12-18. The long recension repeats the reference to the Father's assent as in CG II 5,14.22.29 and parr. whereas the short omits it. From the evidence of the pattern of praise of the female aeons, the Nous would appear to glorify the supreme being rather than Christ, although Christ was responsible for his appearance. Cf. BG 31,2f. where Christ praises the Spirit. CG III 10,13, perhaps aware of the ambiguity, has the plural ("while they praised"), i.e. both Christ and the Nous.
204. Adv.haer. I 29,1 (Harvey I 222).
205. BG 31,10f.; CG III 10,14f. Cf. GEgypt CG III 42,2 = CG IV 51,19f., where the Father brings forth the three ogdoads in silence ( $\epsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon$ ) and providence ( $\pi\rho\acute{\nu}\omicron\iota\varsigma$ ).

206. CG II 7,4ff.; CG IV 10,20ff.
207. CG II 7,4-6; CG IV 10,20-2.
208. BG 31,11f.; CG III 10,15-17. CG III 10,17 has "through a word", which BG 31,12 omits. However, the underlying Greek here could be simply  $\delta\iota\alpha\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\upsilon$  which might be translated into Coptic with a definite or indefinite article.
209. Cf. Iren. adv.haer. I 12,1 (Harvey I 109f.). In the Valentinian dogmatic letter in Epiph. Pan. XXXI 5,4f. (Holl 1,390.13 - 391.5) the Father's Ennoia or Sige wishes to break the eternal bonds and produces the first aeons of the Pleroma.
210. Cf. e.g. Theophilus of Antioch ad Autol. II 10.22. The distinction goes back to Stoicism. See J.N.D. Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines 5th ed., London 1977, pp.10, 18.
211. Apocryphon, p.173.
212. *Ibid.*, pp.173f.
213. *Art.cit.*, p.54.
214. *Ibid.*, pp.54f. She also draws attention to the figure of  $\xi\gamma\gamma\prime / \epsilon\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\iota\delta$  in Irenaeus' account of Valentinianism in adv.haer. I 1,1 (Harvey I 8f.).
215. BG 31,15f.; CG III 10,20f.; CG II 7,9; CG IV 10,26f.
216. BG 31,16-18; CG III 10,21-23; CG II 7,10f.; CG IV 10,27-29. The long recension has  $\epsilon\tau\beta\epsilon\ \pi\omega\delta\chi\epsilon$  and  $\pi\tau\eta\rho\epsilon\iota$ , the short  $\epsilon\beta\omicron\alpha\ \tau\iota\tau\bar{\eta}$  and  $\eta\kappa\alpha\ \eta\mu\iota$ .  $\epsilon\tau\beta\epsilon$  does not appear to mean "by" as Giversen (Apocryphon p.174) takes it, but rather "on account of" ( $\delta\iota\alpha$  + Acc.), or "for the sake of" ( $\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon\kappa\alpha$  + Gen.). BG 31,18f. appears to regard the Autogenes as the subject of the following sentence.
217. Cf. Giversen, Apocryphon, p.174; Arai, NTS 15 (1968/69), p.305. But cf. also the Poimandres (CH I,8) which shows no trace of Christian influence, but which derives the elements of nature from the will ( $\beta\omicron\upsilon\lambda\eta$ ) of God which takes or comprehends the Logos and imitates the noble world it sees (in the Logos?). Christ and the Logos are not identified, as we might



have expected if this passage does represent Christian influence, but the distinction is inevitable since it is rooted in the original text. It is perhaps a further indication of the secondary and Christian character of this section that previously Will took up position with the Light (BG 31,15 and parr.) and not with Christ.

218. Adv.haer. I 29, 1 (Harvey I 222).
219. Apocryphon, pp.174f.
220. Ibid., ; Janssens,art.cit., p.56, with reference to C.A.Baynes, A Coptic Gnostic Treatise contained in the Codex Brucianus Bruce MS. 96 Bod.Lib.Oxford, Cambridge 1933, pp.33-5.
221. Ibid., pp.56f., with reference to Hipp. Ref. V 12,3 (Wendland 104.21-3). Cf. the Hermetic Discourse on the Eight and Ninth (On 8th 9th), CG VI,6,57,14-18; Eug CG III 74,21 - 75,9; 82,7-15.
222. Cf. BG 30,6 and par.; 31,18 and parr.; 32,5.9 and parr.; 34,15.18 and parr.; 35,3.17 and parr.; 51,9.
223. Adv.haer. I 29,2 (Harvey I 223).
224. Cf. GEgypt CG IV 59,29 - 60,11. However in TrimProt CG XIII 38,22f. the Son, the Christ, is called by the Coptic equivalent of  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\eta}\varsigma$  : "he who came into being by himself".
225. The Ennoia and Logos, although thought of as female and male aeons united in a syzygy, are yet in essence hypostatized aspects of the Father who has no consort, and their emission is essentially that of the Father himself.
226. Adv.haer. I 29,1 (Harvey I 222f.).
227. BG 31,19 - 32,2; CG III 10,23 - 11,2; CG II 7,11-15; CG IV 10,29 - 11,5. BG 31,19 links the divine Autogenes with EternalLife by  $\bar{\nu}$  which is evidently wrong. Till (ad loc.) is led to suggest either the erasing of the  $\bar{\nu}$ , as in CG III 10,23, or its emendation to  $\mu\bar{\nu}$ . BG may here retain a trace of a more original form which included Christ, the Autogenes, in the list of aeons. The long recension by its insertion of the particle  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$  (CG II 7,12; CG IV [10,29]) evidently understands the mention of EternalLife to mark the beginning of a new sentence. It too has the divine Autogenes in direct apposition to Christ unlike the short, which has three words intervening.

228. BG 32,1-3; CG III 11,2; CG II 7,13-15; CG IV 11,3-5.  
BG 32,3ff. perhaps aware of this, includes the Spirit of the  
divine (or great?) eternal Autogenes as a recipient of praise.
229. Apocryphon, pp.175f.
230. Ibid., with reference to Schmidt's article in Philotesia, p.325.
231. Till's edition of BG pp.299f.
232. BG 28,5 - 29,18; CG III 8,5- 9,10; CG II 5,11 - 6,8;  
CG IV 7,27 - 9,8.
233. BG 29,14 - 32,19; CG III 9,8 11,14; CG II 6,8 - 7,30;  
CG IV 9,8 - 12,2.
234. Apocryphon, p.176. It is also contained in CG IV, of course.
235. Ibid., pp.176f.
236. "Nag-Hamadi Studien III", ZRGG 14(1962), p.359.
237. BG 32,19 - 33,3; CG III 11,14-18; CG II 7,30-3 ; CG IV 12,  
2-7.
238. Adv.haer. I 29,2 (Harvey I 223).
239. Haer.fab.comp. I 13 (PG 83 364 A).
240.  $\overline{\Phi}\omega\varsigma$  and  $\Theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  are of course neuters, but it would appear  
that they are treated as masculine. Cf. Iren. adv.haer. I 12,1  
(Harvey I 110) where the image of  $\Theta\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\eta\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  is masculine.
241. Art.cit., p.57.
242. Cf. adv.haer. I 29,1 (Harvey I 222f.) ; GEgypt CG III 42,8-10.  
CG IV 51,26 - 52,1 has evidently taken  $\alpha\phi\theta\alpha\rho\sigma\iota\acute{\varsigma}$  to qualify  
Eternal Life.
243. Cf. adv.haer. I 29,2 (Harvey I 223).
244. CG II 7,15-17; CG IV 11,6-9.
245. Cf. CG II 6,23-6 and parr.

246. CG II 7,18-22; CG IV 11,9-14.
247. Cf. CG II 6,15 - 22.26f. and parr. In the case of the taking up position, the long version appears to have adopted the original pattern in which the Light was the subject. See above.
248. BG 32,8-14; CG III 11,6-11.
249. Adv.haer. I 29,2 (Harvey I 223). Could the [πρ]οδ-στασις of CG III 11,5 be the Greek underlying the repraesentatio of the Latin version? The insistence on the first ἐννοια might reflect the fact that the redactors found a reference to Ennoia in their original which they had to reinterpret to refer to Barbelo.
250. CG II 7,20-2; CG IV 11,11-14. This may be a further example of the long recension's preference for Pronoia. ΝΟΜΗ may represent a misreading of ΝΤΙΜΗ.
251. BG 32,12-14; CG III 11,10f. Cf. Untitled Text from the Bruce Codex ch.20 (Schmidt-MacDermot 263.23).
252. CG II 7,22-4; CG IV 11,15-18. Cf. also Col. 2:10.
253. Die drei Versionen, p.63 ad loc.
254. Gnosis, p.106.
255. BG 32,15-18; CG III 11,12f.
256. CG II 7,25-9; CG IV 11,18-24.
257. The whole passage describing the Autogenes/Christ as creating everything by his Logos; as God of all things; with everything subjected to him; named with a name above every name, seems to reflect Christian speculation about the pre-existent Christ as found in Jn.1:1ff.; Rom.9:5; Eph.1:21f.; Phil.2:9; Col. 1:16ff.; 2:10; Heb.1:4; 2:6f. etc.
258. Adv.haer. I 29,2 (Harvey I 223).
259. Cf. adv.haer. I 1,1 (Harvey I 8-10); I 11,1 (Harvey I 98-100).
260. Adv.haer. I 1,2 (Harvey I 10-12); I 11,1 (Harvey I 100).



261. GEgypt CG III 41,23 - 43,8 and par.
262. CG III 42,7-11; CG IV 51,25 - 52,2.
263. CG III 42,11-17; CG IV 52,2-10. Both passages are unfortunately marred by lacunae and cannot be restored from one another. See Böhlig-Wisse, Gospel of the Egyptians, p.172.
264. CG III 42,21 - 43,4; CG IV 52,15-24. See Böhlig-Wisse, *ibid.*
265. *Op.cit.*, p.50.
266. *Ibid.*
267. BG 32,19 - 33,2; CG III 11,14-19 ( ΟΥΟΕΙΝ ); CG II 7,30-3; CG IV 12,2-6 ( φωστήρ ). The long recension omits "great" and has no verb, while BG 33,2 has the singular Δι- instead of the required plural δι- as in CG III 11,19. The confusion is a common one in Coptic texts, perhaps here assisted by the use of the singular numeral ( ΠΕΥΤΟΟΥ ). The form in CG III 11,17 ( ΠΕΥΕΤΟΟΥ , i.e. "his lights") is probably an error. Giversen, Apocryphon, p.179, is probably correct to interpret the omission of "great" with reference to the lights by the long recension as due to the fact that φωστήρ itself represents the idea. Conversely the "great light (ΟΥΟΕΙΝ)" of the short must represent its attempt to translate φωστήρ . Cf. Gen. 1:14 and 1:16 LXX where the former reads φωστήρως and the latter τοῦ δὲ φωστήρος τοὺς μέγλους.
268. Adv.haer. I 29,2 (Harvey I 223: De lumine autem, quod est Christus, et de incorruptela, quatuor emissa luminaria ....). Cf. Theodoret haer.fab.comp. I 13 (PG 83 264 A) who speaks of τὰς ἄλλας προβολὰς, τὰς ἐκ τοῦ φωτός καὶ τῆς Ἀφθαρσίας.
269. BG 32,21 - 33,3; CG III 11,16-18; CG II 7,32-4; CG IV 12,4-6. The reading in BG 32,21- 33,1 is marred by a lacuna at the beginning of 33,1 which Till fills by adding ΝΟΥΟΕΙΝ on the basis of 51,7. However, as Giversen states, it is better to read ἡπεπνῶ with CG II 7,32 (and CG IV 12,4f.). As the more difficult reading, it is perhaps preferable to that of CG III 11,16f. ("the god, the invisible spirit"). However, the latter may suggest that what was in apposition in the original Greek ( τοῦ Θεοῦ, τοῦ πνεύματος ) may have been misinterpreted by the Coptic translator.

270. ZRGG 14 (1962), p.359.
271. BG 33,3f.; CG III 11,19; CG II 7,34 - 8,1. CG II reads: "he saw that they took up position", while the short recension simply has them taking up position, CG III 11,19 using the Greek loan word  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$ . CG IV 12,7 entirely omits this sentence.
272. Cf. BG 28,5 - 29,8 and parr.
273. Adv.haer. I 29,2 (Harvey I 223). Could circumstantia represent an original  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$  as in CG III 11,19?
274. Ibid.
275. BG 33,4f.; CG III 11,20f.; CG II 8,1f. CG IV also omits this passage. CG III 11,20 puts "Eternal Life" second and Ennoia third.
276. Giversen, Apocryphon, p.180, notes that the three are most clearly linked with the preceding Autogenes in CG II 8,1 by its conjunctive,  $\delta\epsilon$ , while BG 33,4 has the indefinite  $\bar{\nu}$  and CG III 11,20 no conjunctive at all. But surely  $\delta\epsilon$  has a disjunctive force and rather tends to mark off the three from the Autogenes. His suggestion that the three plus Christ and Imperishability represent five androgynous aeons and thus the whole decad, is unconvincing since several of them are missing. However, he does point to the way the aeons are paired.
277. BG 33,5-7; CG III 11,21-3.
278. CG II 8,2-4; CG IV 12,7f.
279. Apocryphon, p.181. He cites the Sahidic of Deut. 4:6. Cf. Crum, Dictionary 715a. See also R.McL.Wilson, "A Note on the Gospel of Truth (33.8-9)", NTS 9(1962/63), pp.297f.
280. CG II 8,4. Cf. BG 33,7; CG III 11,23.
281. Cf. BG 33,7 - 34,1; CG III 11,23 - 12,11; CG II 8,4-16 (  $\mu\bar{\nu}\tau\rho\mu\bar{\nu}2\mu\tau$  ). Neither  $\phi\rho\acute{o}\nu\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  nor a Coptic equivalent occur among the aeons of the fourth luminary, which are Perfection, Peace and Sophia (cf. BG 34,6f. and parr.).

282. Cf. GEgypt CG III 52,8-14; CG IV 64,2-8. The former preserves the Greek of all four, the latter has αἰσθησις and Coptic equivalents for the rest.
283. On p.223 of his edition.
284. Ibid. But cf. Giversen, Apocryphon, p.184, who prefers "friend of God" ( 𐩧𐩣𐩪 + 𐩠𐩨 ). The second luminary in the Apocryphon and the Gospel of the Egyptians is Oroiael, which may be derived from the Hebrew ִרְיָאֵל and 𐩠𐩨, i.e. illumination or revelation of God (= αἰσθησις? ). Cf. Giversen, *ibid.*
285. Cf. GEgypt CG III 51,5-19 and par. However, all three are linked by the idea that the four derive from an offspring or power of the great Light.
286. Thus the fact that BG 33,5 and CG II 8,2 have "the Life" instead of "Eternal ( αἰώνιος ) Life" might suggest that the preceding Ἐννοια might have resulted from a misreading in the Greek Vorlage: ΕΝΝΟΙΑ for ΑΙΩΝΙΑ. The order would then correspond exactly to that in Irenaeus' account, first the male, then the female, as with Christ and Imperishability. This confusion must therefore be supposed to have occurred in the Greek original and thus the Coptic would have no hope of reconstructing the original and must have attempted to make sense of it as best it could by adding as a prefix "the three". However, the fact that CG III 11,20f. has Eternal Life in second place, then the Ennoia, might suggest that the Ennoia was original. But the fact of the confusion remains.
287. BG 33,7-10; CG III 11,23 - 12,1; CG II 8,4-6; CG IV 12,9-11. Cf. Iren. adv. haer. I 29,2 (Harvey I 223); GEgypt CG III 52,8-10 and par. The long recension by reading " φωστυρ -aeon" (CG II 8,5; CG IV 12,9f.) has evidently combined two entities which are distinct in the short and which the long itself later distinguishes (cf. CG II 8,8f.), and thus has been led to refer to the first angel with no mention of the aeon. BG's description of the angel as "of the light" is possibly its own addition.
288. BG 33,10-12; CG III 12,1-3.
289. CG II 8,6-8; CG IV 12,11-14.

290. BG 33,12-17; CG III 12,3-8; CG II 8,8-12; CG IV 12,14-20. CG III 12,5 has "in" rather than "over" as in the other three versions (cf. CG III 12,9.11 for the same usage). The "other (κ< ) three aeons" which are associated with the second luminary in CG II 8,11 = CG IV 12,18; again betrays the fact that an attempt is being made to fuse together an aeon scheme with the four luminaries.
291. BG 33,17 - 34,1; CG III 12,8-11; CG II 8,12-16; CG IV 12,20-6. Once more the long recension speaks of "other (κ< ) three aeons" in association with the luminary (CG II 8,15 = CG IV 12,24). CG III 12,8f., in that it reads "In the third luminary he (?) was set in the third aeon", which makes no sense and omits the name of the luminary, must be secondary.
292. BG 34,1-7; CG III 12,11-16. CG III 12,11f. again has its peculiar form, omitting the name of the luminary.
293. CG II 8,16-20; CG IV 12,26 - 13,3.
294. BG 34,7-12; CG III 12,16-21; CG II 8,20-3; CG IV 13,4f. BG 34,8f.11 and CG III 12,20 have the form αὐτογένετος rather than the αὐτογενής of CG III 12,17 and CG II 8,21.23. The change may be a stylistic one. The reference to the four luminaries' stance takes up BG 33,2f. and parr. and echoes Iren. adv.haer. I 29,2 (Harvey I 223: ad circumstantiam Autogeni). Cf. also Untitled Text in the Bruce Codex ch.20 (Schmidt-MacDermot 263.22 - 264.6) which speaks of the Autogenes God, the twelve aeons and the four luminaries together.
295. BG 34,13-15; CG III 12,22-4; CG II 8,25f. BG 34,15 has the form αὐτογενήτης, cf. 30,6.
296. Adv.haer. I 29,2 (Harvey I 223).
297. GEgypt CG III 51,17-19; CG IV 63,12-14. Cf. AJ BG 33,8 - 34,3 and parr.; Zostr CG VIII 51,17f.; Melch CG IX 6,4f.; Untitled Text in the Bruce Codex ch.20 (Schmidt-MacDermot 264.5f.); NatArch CG II 93,18-22 etc. The orthography of the names varies. The Armoges of Irenaeus' account is probably an attempt by the Latin translator to render Armozel. Theodoret, haer.fab.comp. I 13 (PG 83 364 A), speaks of "Hebrew names" (Ἑβραϊκὰ ὀνόματα) which Armozel or Harmozel would represent better than Armoges. An original Oroiael may have been changed to Raguel by a copyist of Irenaeus to fit in with

the reading Thelesis for Enthesis. See above p. 129 n.283.  
For a discussion of the form and meaning of these - evidently Semitic - names see Giversen, Apocryphon, pp.183-5.

298. GEgypt CG III 52,6-16; CG IV 63,27 - 64,10. That this is a result of the Father's approval and the good pleasure (  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\kappa\epsilon\iota\nu$  ) of the whole Pleroma of the lights (CG III 52,3-6 = IV 63,24-7) recalls the pattern of emanation of aeons in the Apocryphon and the reference to the "good pleasure" of the invisible Spirit (BG 34,12f.).
299. GEgypt CG III 52,16 - 53,10 = CG IV 64,10 - 65,2. Cf. AJ BG 33,17 - 34,7 and parr.
300. Cf. GEgypt CG IV 60,19-22; CG III 50,17-24; CG IV 62,16-23. The term  $\pi\iota\sigma\upsilon\varsigma$  is in a lacuna in CG IV 60,20 and 62,23 but is evidently the subject and correctly read by Böhlig and Wisse, The Gospel of the Egyptians, ad loc.
301. Cf. Zostr CG VIII 6,17 - 7,21.
302. 18,14ff.; 19,6-12; 127,14-19.
303. 29,1-12. Cf. 51,17f.
304. 127,14 - 128,7. The names are all masculine in form, but could they be equivalent to the twelve aeons of the Apocryphon?
305. Melch CG IX 6,2-5.
306. Cf. TrimProt CG XIII 38,16 - 39,7.
307. 39,14f.
308. See n.294. Cf. PS Book I ch.14 ( Schmidt-MacDermot 23.6); 2nd Book of Jeu ch.43 (Schmidt-MacDermot 101.23).
309. BG 34,15-18; CG II 8,26-8. CG III has omitted this sentence, perhaps through homoeoteleuton.
310. Adv.haer. I 29,3 (Harvey I 223).
311. BG 34,19- 35,5; CG III 12,24 - 13,1; CG II 8,28-33. CG II 8,30f. has: "through the revelation of the will (  $\sigma\Upsilon\omega\upsilon\varsigma\epsilon$  ) of the invisible Spirit", which is slightly preferable to the short which reads: "through God and the good pleasure of the great

invisible Spirit" (BG 34,20 - 35,2; CG III 12,25f.), which repeats CG III 12,19f. 21f. CG III 13,1 has "before the Autogenes" rather than the more likely "through the good pleasure of the Autogenes" of BG 35,2f. and CG II 8,31f. CG II 9,33 adds "and the truth" to revelation instead of having it qualify the perfect Man as in BG 35,4, CG III 13,2 (which adds "holy") and Iren. adv.haer. I 29,3 (Harvey I 224: hominem perfectum et verum). See Giversen, Apocryphon, p.186. Janssens (art. cit. p.60 n.27) finds echoes of Eph. 1:5 and Luke 2:14 in the mention of  $\epsilon\upsilon\delta\omicron\kappa\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ .

312. Adv.haer. I 29,3 (Harvey I 223f.). The Apocryphon does involve the Autogenes in the appearance of the Perfect Man, if only in terms of his good pleasure. Note the involvement of the invisible Spirit and the Autogenes in this.
313. Cf. GEgypt CG IV 60,28 - 61,18; CG III 49,1-16. Here Adamas is created by a mother deity Mirothoe (i.e. the goddess  $\text{Μεϝροη}$ ). See Böhlig-Wisse, The Gospel of the Egyptians, pp.176f.
314. Cf. Eug CG III 81,12 = SJC CG III 105,12; BG 100,14; OnOrWld CG II 108,21 etc.
315. Cf. Iren. adv.haer. I 29,3 (Harvey I 224:  $\text{Ἀδαμαντᾶ}$  : Adamantem). For the form "Adamas" cf. also OnOrWld CG II 108,23 ( $\text{Ἀδαμᾶν}$ ): GEgypt CG III 49,19; 50,20f. = IV 62,19; III 51,6.21f. etc. ( $\text{Ἀδαμᾶς}$ ); Zostr CG VIII 6,26; 30,4.25; 33,17; 51,14 ( $\text{Ἀδαμᾶς}$ ;  $\text{Ἀδαμᾶν}$  in 30.10).
316. Cf. 3 StSeth CG VII 118,26 ( $\text{Πιτερᾶδαμᾶ}$ ); Zostr CG VIII 6,23; 13,6 ( $\text{Πιτερᾶδαδᾶνᾶς}$ ): Melch CG IX 6,6 ( $\text{Πιτερᾶδαδᾶνᾶς}$ ).
317. Cf. Zostr CG VIII 51,7. This may be the original form, prefixed by the masculine definite article to make the full word. Quispel in a paper at the Eighth International Patristic Conference at Oxford (3rd-5th September, 1979) has suggested that this is the Greek equivalent ( $\delta\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omega\ \text{Ἀδαμᾶς}$ ) of the figure of Adam Qadmon of rabbinic and Mandaean sources. Cf. Harvey's edition of Irenaeus, I 224 n.1.
318. A.K. Helmbold, in his review of Giversen's edition (JNES 25 (1966), pp.263f.), also points that in this text all other uses of the verb to "name" followed by  $\text{ἄς}$  have the name given immediately. Giversen's argument that the scribe must have prolonged the supralinear stroke, which was over the  $\alpha$  of  $\text{ῥᾶ}$ ,



to the left is unconvincing. The form  $\Pi\Gamma\epsilon\rho\alpha\Delta\alpha\mu\alpha\varsigma$  or  $\Pi\Gamma\epsilon\rho\alpha\delta\Delta\alpha\mu\alpha\varsigma$ , as in CG II, may be a later development, since it is apparently unknown to Irenaeus and only occurs in the version in CG II of the Apocryphon. If Quispel's suggestion is correct, it may represent an attempt to distinguish the heavenly Primal Man, Adamas, from his later earthly copy, Adam.

319. Adv.haer. I 29,3 (Harvey I 224).
320. Cf. BG 27, 8-10 and parr.; CG II 5,11; Giversen, Apocryphon, p.186.
321. Cf. BG 47,20 - 49,9 and par.; CG II 14,18- 15,13 and par. Cf. Giversen, *ibid.*
322. Art.cit., p.61.
323. BG 35,6-10; CG III 13,4-9. CG III 13,5 has "in", following its pattern of the installation of the luminaries, (cf. 12,4ff. 9.12), as BG + CG II follow their pattern. CG III 13,5 also has "his aeon", and 13,7 "with Harmozel". BG 35,8 again has  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\omega\rho$  for the  $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\eta\varsigma$  of CG III 13,6 and CG II 9,1.
324. CG II 8,35 -9,3. It omits the attribute "great".
325. Adv.haer. I 29,3 (Harvey I 224).
326. Philotesia, p.329.
327. CG III 13,4 has the Greek loan word  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\kappa\alpha\theta\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\alpha\nu\alpha\iota$ . Could the Greek of Irenaeus have read something like  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\epsilon\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\delta\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu\tau\omega\pi\rho\acute{\omega}\tau\omega\phi\omega\tau\acute{\iota}\tau\omega\text{'}\text{Αρμολ}\acute{\eta}\lambda$ , which the Latin translator, perhaps misled by the prefix  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron-$ , translated remotus cum.... .... ab Armoge?
328. BG 35,10-13; CG III 13,9-11; CG II 9,4f.; CG IV 14,1f.
329. Adv.haer. I 29,3 (Harvey I 224).
330. *Ibid.*
331. *Ibid.*

332. Cf. e.g. adv.haer. V 16,3ff. (Harvey II 368-75) etc. In the Baruch of Justin, the tree of life is the third of Elohim's angels, Baruch, and the tree of knowledge the third of Eden's, Maas. (Hipp. Ref. V 26,6: Wendland 127.21-5).
333. BG 35,20 - 36,2; CG III 13,17-19; CG II 9,11-14.
334. BG 35,13-16; CG III 13,11-13; CG II 9,5-8; CG IV 14,2-6. The short recension begins the direct speech immediately with Adam addressing the Spirit as if in the third person, then switching to the second person. The long, perhaps aware of the clumsiness of this, does not begin the direct speech till the words: "On account of you, everything.....". CG III 13,13 has omitted the phrase: "and because of you all things will return "through homoeoteleuton. Cf. GEgypt CG III 49,8-12; CG IV 61,8-14. Giversen, Apocryphon, p.188, doubts whether there is an allusion to John 1:3 here since the subject in the latter is the Logos and not the supreme being as here. He prefers Rom. 11:36 as a likely source, and Janssens, art.cit. p.61, also cites Rom.11:36 and adds I Cor.8:6 as well.
335. BG 35,17-20; CG III 13,14-17; CG II 9,9-11. CG II 9,9 reads: "I will praise and honour", the future being an error in translation, or a matter of style, the second verb being introduced on the analogy of 9,6. CG III 13,15 has "the aeon" against the plural form of BG 35,18 and CG II 9,10. Cf. Rom. 11:36:  $\delta\delta\epsilon\zeta\alpha \dots \epsilon\tau\iota\varsigma \tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\varsigma \alpha\iota\omega\upsilon\epsilon\varsigma$ .
336. Adv.haer. I 29,3 (Harvey I 224).
337. Barbelo is called an aeon but not the great Aeon, in I 29,1 (Harvey I 222), and is said to be in virginal Spirit (ibid.), just as all things are said to be here, in I 29,3.
338. On p.111 of his edition.
339. Art.cit., p.61.
340. For the hierarchy Autogenes - aeons - Adamas, cf. GEgypt CG IV 59,29 - 61,18 = CG III 49,1 - 16; for the Father, Mother, Son, cf. CG III 41,7-12 = IV 50,23 - 51,2; III 41,23 - 42,4 = IV 51,15-22; for the luminaries, cf. CG III 51,14-19 = IV 63,8-14.



341. Cf. e.g. Zostr CG VIII 6,21-6; 30,4-10.
342. BG 35,20; CG III 13,16f.; CG II 9,11. Cf. BG 27,13f.; CG III 7,18f.; CG II 4,33f.
343. Cf. BG 21,19-21; CG II 2,13-15; CG IV 3,6-8.
344. BG 35,20 - 36,14; CG III 13,17 - 14,8; CG II 9,11-23.
345. Thus BG 36,1 has Seth over the second luminary rather than over the second aeon, having missed out this idea through homoeoteleuton. (See Till ad loc.). CG III 13,17ff. continues its pattern by having Seth set in the second aeon, and it contains the names of the third and fourth luminaries omitted on the previous occasion, cf. 12,8.12. CG II 9,14-17, in that it has the seed of Seth in the third aeon, apparently in distinction from the souls of the saints who are over the third luminary, would appear to be secondary, since the two categories appear to be synonymous.
346. Cf. Zostr CG VIII 6,17 - 7,20.
347. BG 36,15; CG III 14,8f.; CG II 9,23f. The last stresses the creaturely character of these beings, which might suggest either that it saw Seth as a creature, or that it understood this clause as referring only to the last group, the ignorant souls. Cf. Iren. adv. haer. I 29,3 (Harvey I 224).

## CHAPTER TWO

Gnostic Theogony and Cosmogony: (b) The Lower World(a) The Fall of Sophia

With the abrupt mention of the aeon Sophia by the Apocryphon,<sup>1</sup> a new section begins, which will trace to her error the origin of this present world of deficiency, ruled by an ignorant and arrogant Creator-god or Demiurge and his seven archons, who created the visible universe and man in the image of the heavenly world, to gain control over that world and its aeons. The idea that a female heavenly being, often the - ironically named - Sophia, was responsible for the tragic split in the heavenly world, which gave rise to the present situation of the Gnostic as a divine spark or self trapped in matter and oblivion, is a very common Gnostic theme,<sup>2</sup> and forms the basic presupposition of the Valentinian system in particular.<sup>3</sup>

That Sophia is called an aeon here is evidently meant to identify her as the last of the three aeons associated with the fourth luminary Eleleth, and thus the twelfth in order of appearance and the furthest removed in the heavenly world from the invisible Spirit. This conception, of course, recalls the Valentinian duodecad of aeons produced by Man and Church of which the last pair is Desired (Theletos) and Sophia.<sup>4</sup> We have noted in the previous chapter the likelihood that the Apocryphon's twelve aeons represent an independent tradition grafted on to the scheme of four luminaries and their helpers or

consorts. This has resulted in the omission of one of those helpers,  $\phi\rho\acute{o}\nu\eta\tau\iota\varsigma$ , perhaps to allow room for Sophia. In a comparison with the parallel in the Gospel of the Egyptians, which added a further ogdoad of four ministers and four female consorts, we found a further three of the aeons of the Apocryphon's twelve, in addition to the three helpers of the luminaries (Grace, Perception, Insight). Thus the list has the appearance of an artificial construction. Only the number (twelve) and the name of the last aeon (Sophia) are important, the former acting as the heavenly archetype for the ensuing creation of the twelve signs of the Zodiac by the Demiurge, the latter being identified as the female aeon responsible for the production of that Demiurge and hence of the created order beneath the heavenly world.

The two recensions differ in an interesting way over how Sophia is described, which may cast some further light on her origin. The short recension calls her "our fellow-sister ( $\omega\varsigma\bar{\sigma}\rho\omega\nu\epsilon$ )", <sup>5</sup> while CG II 9,25 describes her as "the Sophia of Epinoia". The former is echoed in the Second Logos of the Great Seth, <sup>6</sup> while the Epinoia of the latter may be a reference to the first of the three aeons with the second luminary, <sup>7</sup> but is more likely to signify the Redeemer/Revealer of the latter part of the Apocryphon, sent to help Adam in his struggle with the powers of darkness and correct Sophia's deficiency. <sup>8</sup>

However, Giversen's suggestion that this phrase presupposes an unknown account which has disappeared, may be even nearer the truth

in the light of the evidence of the Trimorphic Protennoia about the origin of Sophia and her relation to Epinoia.

After describing the appearance and establishment of the four aeons, the Trimorphic Protennoia relates how, in response to a word from the great luminary Eleleth proclaiming his kingly role and asking who belonged to chaos and the underworld, his light appeared endowed with Epinoia. This led to the appearance of the great Demon, Saklas, i.e. Samael, Ialtabaoth, who had taken power from the guileless one (i.e. Sophia). He had at first overpowered the Epinoia of light who had descended, from whom he himself had come forth from the first.<sup>9</sup> The text then speaks of the request of the Epinoia of light for a better order and the blessing and agreement of the higher order, and then of how, when the great Demon began to produce aeons in the likeness of the real Aeons, the Protennoia called on him to desist, since she was about to descend for the sake of her portion imprisoned there since the guileless Sophia who had descended was conquered.<sup>10</sup> Despite a certain degree of ambiguity, the text appears to be describing the origin of Sophia, the Epinoia of light, from Eleleth, and her descent and production of Saklas/Ialdabaoth.

We shall see the close parallelism of the whole passage with the Apocryphon in due course, but wish to draw attention to certain features of the description of Sophia in these various accounts, in relation to Irenaeus' summary of the Barbelognostic system. The motif of the twelve aeons in the image of the heavenly world, which is

absent in Irenaeus, we have suggested represents a tradition which the Apocryphon has incorporated into the original scheme involving luminaries and helpers only. The derivation of Sophia in Irenaeus' account can also perhaps be reconciled to the Apocryphon, or at least be shown to be related. Thus he records how from the first angel who stands beside Monogenes there was emanated the Holy Spirit, also called "Sophia" and "Prunicus".<sup>11</sup> Although he has not used the term "Monogenes" previously, it would appear to refer to the Autogenes, as in the Apocryphon.<sup>12</sup> Again on the analogy of the Apocryphon, the "first angel" could be taken to refer to the first luminary, Armoges, who stands round Autogenes with the others.<sup>13</sup> Both Irenaeus' account and the Apocryphon appear to represent a tradition which derives Sophia from one of the great luminaries, a tradition given in greater detail in the Trimorphic Protennoia and Gospel of the Egyptians.

Furthermore, the evidence of the Trimorphic Protennoia that Epinoia and Sophia are apparently synonymous might suggest that the Apocryphon's ensuing distinction between the two, with the former as the Redeemer/Revealer, the latter as entirely in need of redemption, may represent later theological reinterpretation of an earlier tradition, such as that of the Ophites of Irenaeus and of the Valentinians, that Sophia was responsible for the original fault or defect, yet also acted as a redeemer.<sup>14</sup> Again, as Epinoia, Sophia appears as the afterthought,

in contrast to the Pronoia or Barbelo, the Father's first thought, and she is appropriately linked with the fourth luminary Eleleth since, like the souls who will eventually reach that luminary as their final abode, she did have knowledge of her perfection but acted in despite of that, and only eventually repented, as we shall see.

Since Sophia is an aeon, the Apocryphon continues, she conceived a thought (  $\text{ΜΕΕΥΕ}$  ) out of herself and through the thought (  $\text{ΜΕΕΥΕ} / \text{ἐνθ' ὁμοῦσης}$  ) of the Spirit and the Prognosis, and willed to reveal her image.<sup>15</sup> The two recensions diverge slightly over the reaction to this. Thus the short continues that this happened although the Spirit had neither agreed to this nor nodded assent (  $\text{κατανέειν}$  ) nor had her consort (  $\text{σὺζυγος}$  ), the male virginal spirit (  $\text{παρθενικὸν πνεῦμα}$  ), joined in agreeing (  $\text{συνεῖδοκεῖν}$  ).<sup>16</sup> The long has this happen without the wish of the Spirit, since her consort had not agreed (  $\text{ἐὺδοκεῖν}$  ), and without his conception (  $\text{ἐνθ' ὁμοῦσης}$  ). For (  $\text{δέ}$  ) the person (  $\text{πρόσωπον}$  ) of her masculinity had not joined in agreement (  $\text{συνεῖδοκεῖν}$  ).<sup>17</sup> The preceding pattern of emanation, i.e. the production of the four luminaries by Light/Christ and Imperishability and the production of the perfect true Man by Nous and Prognosis, involved the union of a male and a female aeon and the agreement of the invisible Spirit.<sup>18</sup> Thus that Sophia acts here both without the agreement (  $\text{ἐὺδοκεῖν}$  ) of the Spirit and of her consort (  $\text{σὺζυγος} / \text{υἱ βρῆν ἡ ζωτῆρ}$  ) may confirm the hypothesis that the

earlier male and female aeons were ἀνδρικός, as in Irenaeus' account.

The fact that the short recension identifies Sophia's consort as the male virginal spirit, a title which only occurs here in the Apocryphon, and the evident difficulty the long recension has with the consort, which leads it to its tortuous paraphrase "the person of her masculinity", suggest the rather secondary and artificial nature of this figure. Later on in the Apocryphon we hear only that the consort descended to correct Sophia's deficiency,<sup>19</sup> that he will be sent out to her,<sup>20</sup> or that it is the Epinoia who will correct her fault,<sup>21</sup> which might suggest that the Epinoia is the consort, the male virginal spirit.<sup>22</sup> This would fit in very well with our suggestion that Epinoia and Sophia represent two aspects of the original single figure. The long recension's paraphrase: "the person (or "outward appearance"; προσωπον) of her maleness", has attempted to correct the impression of the preceding mention of Sophia's consort as a separate being, the male virgin spirit, by dropping the title and reinterpreting him as the male aspect of the single figure of Sophia. But, paradoxically, this may point to the original state of affairs. Schenke, too, finds the consort a shadowy figure, behind whom ultimately lies the Supreme Father, as behind Sophia lies the Mother, the Ennoia or Barbelo.<sup>23</sup>

Certainly that Sophia found herself without a partner while all the other aeons had one, and sought to find one with whom she could be

united, an impulse made without the agreement (bona voluntas; i.e. εὐδοκία ?) of the Father, is what Irenaeus' version recounts.<sup>24</sup> There may be some hint of this in the continuation in the Apocryphon that since she had not found her partner she assented (κκτα νένειν; BG, CG III) or thought (CG II), although the similarity is weakened by the addition that this was without the agreement (εὐδοκία in the short, οΥωω in CG II) of the Spirit and the knowledge of her partner.<sup>25</sup> However, the two versions can be reconciled in that Irenaeus' account never actually denies that Sophia does possess or will find a consort.<sup>26</sup>

The Apocryphon then has Sophia produce her conception, through the wantonness (? πρὸς νικον ) in her, according to BG 37,10f., or through the watchfulness (? φρουρικόν ) in her, according to CG III 15,2f., while CG II 9,35 - 10,1 has her bring it forth on account of the invincible power in her.

The reading in BG clearly recalls Sophia's title in Irenaeus' account; Prunicus, and can be seen to be more original than the evident emendations in CG III 15,3 to φρουρικόν and in CG II. 10,1 to "invincible power".<sup>27</sup> The latter, as Giversen suggests, is best seen<sup>as</sup> further evidence of the tendency of the long recension to an exalted and much less crude and anthropomorphic portrayal of the world of light.<sup>28</sup> πρὸς νικον, on the other hand, meaning "lustful" or "lascivious" or "wanton",<sup>29</sup> supplies a very satisfactory



motivation for Sophia's action here. In Irenaeus' account of the Barbelognostics, "Prunicus" is clearly a title for the holy Spirit or Sophia, which is derived from her wanton and bold action of seeking a consort by extending herself and looking in the lower regions, and when that failed, of leaping forth and finally moved by innocence (simplicitas; i.e. ἀκακία ?) and goodness (benignitas) generating a work in which was ignorance and audacity.<sup>30</sup> In the Ophite system which Irenaeus describes in the following chapter (I 30), the power which overflows from the Holy Spirit, the First Woman, as a result of her union with First Man and his Son, is also fitly called "Prunicus" as well as Sophia from the wanton way (petulanter) she stirs up the waters of chaos into which she descends in innocence (simpliciter).<sup>31</sup>

M.P. Nilsson has argued that the term προύvikος has the primary sense of "bearer" in popular classical usage, and that the same sense applies to the Gnostic use of it. The Church Fathers, he feels, are responsible for giving the word an obscene connotation to discredit the Gnostics, and he cites Epiphanius' own definition of it.<sup>32</sup> But, as H. Chadwick has pointed out, it is probable that the Gnostics used the word because of its double meaning, and the fact that it occurs in a Gnostic primary document, the Apocryphon, suggests that its sexual meaning has not been foisted on the Gnostics by the heresiologists.<sup>33</sup> The pagan philosopher, Celsus, writing a few years before Irenaeus, also mentions a power flowing from a certain virgin

Προσυτικός, which Origen explains as a name given by the Valentinians to Sophia.<sup>34</sup> Although no precise evidence of this has yet turned up, the idea of the wantonness or procreative nature (προσυτικός) of the supreme female being in the Valentinian system, Ennoia or Sige, and of her emanations, plays a central role in the Valentinian doctrinal letter preserved by Epiphanius.<sup>35</sup>

It is Epiphanius too who supplies further information about the figure Prunicus. Discussing the Simonians he speaks of Simon's claim to be the great power and of his prostitute consort, the Holy Spirit, and then quotes a passage in which Simon describes his descent to his Ennoia, who is also called "Προσυτικός" and "Holy Spirit". This figure of Προσυτικός, comments Epiphanius, is called Barbero or Barbelo in other heresies.<sup>36</sup> This comment would appear to refer to his discussion of the Nicolaitans, some of whom revere Barbelo (who, like the Ennoia/Helen/Prunicus of the Simonians, is responsible for the seduction of the archons), and some of whom honour Prunicus herself.<sup>37</sup> Barbelo and Prunicus would therefore appear to be akin, if not synonymous. Prunicus also appears in Epiphanius' account of the Ophite heresy, in which he gives an explanation of the term as "bad (ἀχρηστός)".<sup>38</sup> This evidence not only confirms the originality of the reading of BG 37,11, but also the sexual meaning of the term and a link with, and possible influence upon, Valentinianism. It may also, if we accept the reliability of Epiphanius' information and judgment, add some weight to the hypothesis that Sophia and Barbelo

were originally identical.

Sophia's thought, continues the Apocryphon, did not remain idle, and her work appeared incomplete and unlike her form because she had created it without her consort.<sup>39</sup> This motif of creation by Sophia without her consort underlies a number of Gnostic systems and texts; what distinguishes them is the explanation of Sophia's action offered. Thus Irenaeus' account of the Barbelognostics has Sophia seek her partner in vain and thereafter, impelled by guilelessness and generosity, generate a work (opus , i.e. ἔργον ?) in which was ignorance and boldness ( αὐθάρδεια /audacia).<sup>40</sup> The Hypostasis of the Archons simply relates how Sophia who is called "Pistis" wanted to make a work ( ἔργον ) by herself, without her partner ( ὁμοῦ ), and that work ( ἔργον ) became the images of heaven. The shadow, which came into being beneath the curtain thus formed, became matter, and in successive materialisations became a work ( ἔργον ) in the matter like an abortion, taking shape ( ὁμοῦ ) from the shadow and becoming an arrogant ( αὐθάρδης ) beast in the form of a lion.<sup>41</sup> Hippolytus' account of Valentinianism reflects a more sophisticated version of the motif which has Sophia observe that, while all the rest of the aeons produced in syzygies, the Father alone produced without a consort, which results in her attempt to imitate him. But because of the difference in nature between him and her she only succeeded in emanating a shapeless ( ἄμορφος ) and

incomplete ( ἡ κατὰ τὴν ἐκείνην οὐσίαν ) substance.<sup>42</sup> The Ptolemeans of Irenaeus have an even more demythologized account which explains Sophia's motivation as a desire to comprehend the greatness of the supreme Father, a passion she suffered apart from the embrace of her consort.<sup>43</sup>

The version of the Apocryphon preserved by BG, which presents Sophia as acting without her consort because of the *πρὸς ἑαυτήν* in her, can thus be seen as an early stage in the process of development whereby the attribute ("wanton") became a title (as among the Barbelognostics and Ophites of Irenaeus, the Simonians, Nicolaitans and Ophites of Epiphanius, and the Valentinians of Origen), and the exclusively sexual and mythological understanding of Sophia's action became increasingly sublimated and demythologized (as in the long recension of the Apocryphon and in the various schools of Valentinianism).

The Apocryphon further emphasises the lack of similarity of Sophia's offspring to her image since it was of a different form (μορφῇ). Sophia saw in her reflection (short recension) or resolve (CG II) that it was of a different type ( *τὸ ἕτερον* ), with the countenance ( *ὄψις* ) of a snake and a lion and eyes gleaming like a fire.<sup>44</sup> Sophia cast it away from those regions lest any of the immortals see it because she had produced it in ignorance. She surrounded it with a cloud of light and placed a throne in the middle of the cloud to ensure

no one saw it except the holy Spirit, who is called "the Mother of all living", and she called it "Ialdabaoth". This is the first archon

( ἄρχων ).<sup>45</sup>

Now Irenaeus' account of the Barbelognostics simply names the work of Sophia "First archon" ( πρῶτος ἀρχων / Proarchon), with no mention of its appearance and proper name, although his reference to the ignorance present in this work recalls the Apocryphon's statement that Sophia had produced her abortion in ignorance.<sup>46</sup> However, the first offspring of Sophia Prunicus according to the Ophite system described in Irenaeus' following chapter is indeed called Ialdabaoth.<sup>47</sup> Could it be that the Apocryphon has here combined two distinct traditions about Sophia's offspring, the one dealing with the anonymous chief or first archon, the other with Ialdabaoth? Certainly the meaning of the name is much disputed.<sup>48</sup> Scholars appear to be generally agreed in deriving the first element, Ialda - from the Aramaic for; (a) child or (b) begetting,<sup>49</sup> but they differ greatly over the meaning of the second element.<sup>50</sup> Some scholars have preferred to see the whole term as referring to Yahweh.<sup>51</sup>

But the origin of the Gnostic Demiurge and his name cannot simply be traced to the God of the Old Testament; he must have some independent role, and therefore the explanation of his name should be perhaps sought from an examination of the role he plays in the Gnostic systems in which he appears. Thus the etymology suggested by

J. Matter,  $\text{בן חורבן}$  ("child of chaos")<sup>52</sup> may find some support from the Untitled Treatise from Codex II, which besides supplying a fallacious etymology ("Youth, cross over!"  $\text{בן חורבן}$   $\text{עבר}$ ),<sup>53</sup> plainly has Ialdabaoth originate from the waters of chaos<sup>54</sup> and calls his mother "the Abyss".<sup>55</sup> In similar passages in the Hypostasis of the Archons and the Pistis Sophia, it is clear that the arrogant leonine archon, Ialdabaoth, is not the immediate offspring of Sophia, but derives from her shadow or material projection cast into chaos.<sup>56</sup> It is surely significant that in the Hypostasis and the Trimorphic Protennoia "Ialdabaoth" occurs as an interpretation of the archon's primary name, "Saklas".<sup>57</sup> Furthermore, there seems to be some ambiguity in the Apocryphon's double insistence on the unlikeness of Sophia's offspring in that the first instance appears to be suggesting that that offspring is incomplete and lacking in form, since it was created without Sophia's male partner, while the second insists that it has a form, that of a snake and lion.<sup>58</sup>

Finally, on the question of the relation with Valentinianism, besides the similarities over Sophia's action and her production of a formless abortion which we noted particularly in Hippolytus' account, there is a passage in Irenaeus' account of the views of the Ptolemeans which suggests further parallels. In a discussion of the role of Horos and the confirmation of Sophia so that she abandons her previous idea (  $\epsilon\nu\theta\upsilon\mu\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  ), Irenaeus inserts a section which he attributes

to certain others of the Valentinians.<sup>59</sup> Their version of the passion and return of Sophia speaks of her attempting something impossible and incomprehensible and bearing a shapeless (  $\sigma\upsilon\rho\phi\omicron\varsigma$  ) substance, such as was the nature of the female to produce. When she had considered it carefully (  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\nu\omicron\epsilon\iota\lambda$  ; intendere ), first she felt grief because of the incompleteness of its generation, then felt fear, amazement, and stupor trying to discover the reason and to find a way of concealing what had been produced. From these emotions, material substance had its original beginning. This version would appear to echo the Apocryphon's more mythological presentation which involves only one Sophia figure, who is directly responsible for the production of the Demiurge and who eventually repents and asks for the rest of the aeons to intercede with the Father on her behalf.<sup>60</sup> Such a scheme, of course, resembles the views of Valentinus and Theodotus rather than those of the Ptolemeans or the Valentinians of Hippolytus' account, who have two Sophias, one who remains in the heavenly world, and her hypostatized passion, Achamoth, who is excluded from that world.<sup>61</sup>

(b) The Creation of the World of Darkness

(i) The Twelve

With the production by Sophia (without the knowledge and consent of her partner or the invisible Spirit) of an incomplete being, whose



unlikeness to Sophia is particularly stressed, we enter a new phase or stage, that of the lower beings, who are generated or begotten rather than emanated or revealed spontaneously. Thus Ialdabaoth took a great power from the Mother, removed himself from her, and turned away from the region (  $\tau\acute{o}\pi\omicron\varsigma$  ) in which he had been born and took possession of another region or regions.<sup>62</sup> This is closely paralleled by Irenaeus' account, which talks of the Protarchon as the creator (fabricator) of this present condition, which certainly fits his role in the Apocryphon, seizing a great power from the Mother, and departing from her into the nether regions.<sup>63</sup> The short recension relates how he created for himself a flaming fiery aeon in which he now resides,<sup>64</sup> which is perhaps slightly closer to Irenaeus' account, which has him create a firmamentum coeli in which he is said to dwell (habitare),<sup>65</sup> than CG II, which speaks of other aeons and has him in the gleaming fiery flame.<sup>66</sup>

The short recension then relates how Ialdabaoth united with his folly (  $\alpha\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$  /  $\mu\eta\tau\alpha\tau\lambda\omicron\omicron\upsilon\nu$  ) and brought into being the powers (  $\epsilon\chi\theta\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$  ) which are under him and (or as) twelve angels, each one to his aeon, according to the pattern (  $\tau\acute{o}\pi\omicron\varsigma$  ) of the imperishable aeons. He created for each of them (BG) or they (CG III) (i.e. the powers?) created for themselves/seven angels and the angels three powers, so that all those under him form 360 angelic beings

( Ἐγγελαίᾳ ) and his third power, according to the appearance of the first pattern ( ἑνπερ ) before him.<sup>67</sup> The version in CG II, however, has Ialdabaoth stupefied ( ἑνωμῆ ) in his ignorance ( ἑκπενοίᾳ ) in which he is, and bringing powers into existence for himself, at which point it launches into the list of twelve powers, of which the last is said to be over the depth of the underworld.<sup>68</sup> It is only later that we have, in two separate passages, a parallel to the enumeration of the angels and powers, (which, however, is different and adds up to 365<sup>69</sup>) and a parallel to the idea of creation after the heavenly pattern (which denies that Ialdabaoth actually saw the heavenly world).<sup>70</sup> Irenaeus' account supplies a partial parallel which again appears to show closer affinities with the short recension. His text relates that, since Ialdabaoth was in ignorance, he created the powers (potestas; i.e. δυνάμεις or ἐξουσίαι ?) which are under him, and angels and firmaments and all earthly things.<sup>71</sup>

Irenaeus is evidently summarising at this point, but his order may help us to reconstruct the order of events in the Apocryphon. Thus Irenaeus' order of powers then angels may confirm the originality of CG III 16,9 which has powers and the twelve angels. This distinction would also solve the arithmetical problem of arriving at 360 angelic beings.<sup>72</sup> Just who these beings are will become clear when we consider the list of twelve powers which follows in both recensions. The short introduces them as appearing from the First Begetter ( ἁρχιγενέτωρ ),

the first archon of darkness, from the ignorance of him who begot them,<sup>73</sup> while CG II plunges straight in, although it does have a similar allusion to Ialdabaoth later as an ignorant darkness, which leads to an excursus on light and darkness and the nature, names, and boast of the first archon, which is absent in the short recension.<sup>74</sup>

The enumeration of the twelve is slightly different in the four versions, although what survives of CG IV appears to correspond to CG II.<sup>75</sup>

The parallel in the Gospel of the Egyptians is unfortunately marred by lacunae (CG III) or very fragmentary (CG IV)<sup>76</sup>. According to it,

the great angel Saklas and the great demon Nebruel together begot twelve assisting angels, each with his aeon, and each to rule over his world.<sup>77</sup> Its list is almost, but not quite, identical with that of the long recension of the Apocryphon.<sup>78</sup> The chief differences between

the various versions are: (1) over the form of the first name, Iaoth ( Ἰᾰωϑ ) in BG 40,5; 41,18; 43,13, Haoth ( Ἠᾰωϑ ) in CG III 16,20<sup>79</sup> and Athoth( Ἀϑωϑ ) in CG II 10,29; 11,26; 12,16.<sup>80</sup> Both

AJ CG II 10,29f. and GEgypt CG III 58,8-10 add that he is called another name by the generations of men, but unfortunately both have a lacuna where the name occurs; (2) over the form of the third name, BG 40,8 and CG III 16,23 reading Galila ( Γᾰλιλᾰ ) and CG II 10,32 having Kalilaoimbri.<sup>81</sup> (3) More significant is the difference between the names of the fifth, sixth and seventh: BG 40,9-13 and CG III 16,23 - 17,1 record them as Adonaios, Sabaoth and Kainan, who is usually

called "Kain", viz. "the sun",<sup>82</sup> while CG II 10,33-6 = IV 17,1f. and GEgypt CG III 58,13-17 = IV 70,1-3 have Adonaios who is called "Sabaoth", Kain whom the races of men call "the sun", and Abel.<sup>83</sup>

(4) Both CG II 11,2 and GEgypt CG III 58,20 have a longer form than the Adonin ( Δ Δ Ω Ν Ι Ν ) of BG 40,17 and CG III 17,4, namely Melcheiradonin ( Μ Ε Λ Χ Ε Ι Ρ Δ Δ Ω Ν Ι Ν ) and Arch[eiradonin] ( Α Ρ Χ [ Ε Ι Ρ Δ Δ Ω Ν Ι Ν ] ), respectively.<sup>84</sup>

Just who these twelve powers or angels are is made clear by the continuation in the short recension. According to it, they all possess other names from desire ( ἐπιθυμία ) and wrath ( ὀργή ). They all have double names given to them through the glory (BG) or glories (CG III) of heaven. It is these latter which correspond to the truth which reveals their nature.<sup>85</sup> Now Saklas, the short continues, called them by these (former?) names according to appearance ( φαντασία ) and their power (or powers). Through the glories (CG III) or the times (BG) they grow distant and weak, but through these (former names?) they regain strength and increase or wax ( αὐξάνειν ).<sup>86</sup> As Till has noted, these twelve powers are clearly related to the signs of the Zodiac, which wax and wane through time.<sup>87</sup>

As Giversen has plausibly argued, the names given by the Apocryphon are the true names, those given by the glory of heaven, which reveal the true nature of these powers created by Saklas in imitation of the twelve heavenly aeons, whereas Saklas' names for them are the names

of desire and wrath, whereby the signs regain strength.<sup>88</sup>

The picture presented by the short recension of this whole section involving the twelve powers created in the image of the twelve heavenly aeons with their double names whereby they wax and wane, and the 360 angelic beings deriving from them, makes very good sense. The twelve powers represent the twelve constellations of the Zodiac, part of the circle of the fixed stars, which wax and wane through time, and the 360 angelic beings deriving from them represent the 360 degrees of the zodiacal circle or the 360 days of the civil year.<sup>89</sup> This would explain why we have the list of beings at this point and the apparent lack of correlation of them with any later entities.

Confirmation of the fact that the twelve names represent the signs of the Zodiac attributed to the sun, moon and five planets (or their rulers) whom the Apocryphon proceeds to mention in the following passage (BG 41,16 - 42,10 and parr.), has been supplied by the persuasive article of A.J. Welburn.<sup>90</sup> After discussing the identity and order of the seven planetary rulers (Iaoth/Athoth = Moon; Eloaios = Mercury; Astaphaios = Venus; Iao = Sun; Adonaios/Sabaoth = Mars; Adoni = Jupiter; Sabbataios/Sabbede = Saturn), Welburn demonstrates that the twelve powers must represent the signs of the Zodiac beginning with Leo (Iaoth/Athoth) linked with the Sun, then Virgo (Hermas) linked with Mercury out to both Sabaoth or Kain, the sixth power (i.e. Capricorn), and Kainan or Abel, the seventh

(i.e. Aquarius), who share the same planet, Saturn, and back, in order, to Cancer (Belias) who must be linked with the nearest planet, the Moon.<sup>91</sup> This explains both the double occurrence of Iobel in fourth and ninth positions: Iobel probably represents the Hebrew for "Ram", both fourth and ninth signs (Scorpio and Aries) being governed by the same planet, viz. Mars. "Hermas", of course, must be Mercury/Hermes, and the very odd form Melcheiradonin, which Giversen rightly interpreted as equivalent to the double constellation βασιλῆς τε καὶ ἁδωνις of Teucer Babylonius (referred to by the Egyptian astronomer Rhetorius),<sup>92</sup> represents Gemini.<sup>93</sup> Welburn also offers a plausible solution to the question of which version of the names of the fifth, sixth, and seventh powers was original. He argues that the long recension identified Adonaios and Sabaoth, influenced no doubt by Jewish usage, and was forced to add another name after Kain/Cain, namely Cain's brother Abel.<sup>94</sup> As Welburn has also suggested, mention of "the sun" in seventh place (as in BG and CG III) rather than in the sixth (as in CG II and GEgypt CG III and IV) fits the division of twelve signs into seven day signs and five night signs.<sup>95</sup>

When we then consider the order of events in the long recension, we find a much more complicated picture. Thus, as we have noted, the long recension gives no indication of who or what the twelve are apart from describing the twelfth, Belias, as over the depth of the underworld.<sup>96</sup> It then proceeds to speak of Ialdabaoth establishing seven kings, in

accordance with the heavenly firmament ( ἑρσέωμυ ), over the seventh heaven and five over the depth of Hell. He gave them a share of his fire, but not of the power of light he had taken from his Mother, since he is an ignorant darkness.<sup>97</sup> Then follows the passage, unique to the long recension, on the mixture of light and darkness, the three names of the archon, his boast that he alone was God,<sup>98</sup> after which we have the enumeration of angels. This passage speaks of the archons (the number of whom is not given, but cannot be twelve, since that would ruin the arithmetic) creating seven powers for themselves, the powers creating six angels for each until they made 365 angels.<sup>99</sup> However, as Giversen admits, the sum is awkward and the long recension seems more concerned with the final total of 365 to which it remains faithful (as does BG to 360) than with the precise arithmetic required.<sup>100</sup>

The long then gives the names and forms of appearance of the seven (archons?) who comprise the hebdomad of the week (i.e. the seven planets); repeats that he gave them a share of his fire; alludes once more to his arrogant boast, and enumerates the seven powers which he united with the (seven?) authorities.<sup>101</sup> Only then do we discover that all these beings (or perhaps only the last-named) have two names. They were named according to the glory of those who do not belong to heaven (or "the non-heavenly ones"). But in the names which were given them by the Archigenetor there was power,



while the names given them according to the glory of the non-heavenly ones are for them destruction and powerlessness.<sup>102</sup> Finally it is stated that the chief archon organized everything after the pattern of the first aeons so as to create them after the form of the imperishable ones. This was not, the long recension continues, because he had seen the imperishable ones, but the power which is in him, which he had taken from his mother, produced in him the likeness of the cosmos.<sup>103</sup>

Conversely, the short recension gives a simpler and more coherent outline of events. After the enumeration of the twelve powers of the Zodiac with their names given through the heavenly glory, it has Ialdabaoth command that seven kings rule over the (seven?) heavens and five over chaos and the underworld (CG III) or the chaos of the underworld (BG).<sup>104</sup> But that these are not the same as the twelve powers, as Till and the long recension appear to imagine,<sup>105</sup> is suggested not only by the new stage marked by "and" and the new title, "kings", but by the fact that the seven glory-names given do not correspond to the first seven glory-names of the twelve powers, with the exception of the first and fifth names.<sup>106</sup>

Furthermore, these seven are expressly identified as those over the seven heavens and as the hebdomad of the week, who control the cosmos.<sup>107</sup> Later these same seven archons are responsible for the creation of psychic man.<sup>108</sup> It must therefore be these

seven archons whom the long recension is alluding to when it refers to the creation of the 365 angels. Further it is they as creators of psychic man who alone are properly described as being given a share of Ialdabaoth's fire but not of his power, as is the case at this point in the short recension;<sup>109</sup> that this is originally attributed to the twelve and then repeated of the seven in the long recension is evidently a doublet. From the mention of the seven and their forms of appearance till the enumeration of the seven powers united with them the two recensions are in agreement again. The long, however, with its passage about the double names, which best fits the twelve zodiacal powers, as we have seen, evidently breaks the continuity of BG, which refers to the seven powers as having a firmament (στέρωμα) in every aeon heaven after the aeon-likeness which existed from the beginning in the pattern (τύπος) of the imperishable ones.<sup>110</sup>

If, therefore, we assume that the version in the short recension (with its twelve zodiacal powers and 360 angels representing the degrees of the zodiacal circle alongside, but distinct from, the seven planetary rulers and five kings of the underworld) is original, how can we account for the differences in the long recension? The two crucial factors, I believe, are the number 365 and the identification of the twelve powers with the seven planetary rulers and five kings of the underworld. The long recension requires the first because of the tradition not present in the short recension which it incorporates in the

description of the creation of man which names (some of) the 365 angels and the bodily parts they created.<sup>111</sup> The long recension has thus been led to overlook the zodiacal significance of the 360 angelic beings, and interpret the 365 angels in terms of the days of the year, which are under the control of the seven planetary rulers or archons. But since it had identified these seven planetary rulers with the first seven of the twelve, it felt the necessity of transposing the account of the creation of the 365 from its original context to after the mention of the seven and five.

The apparent identification by the long recension of the twelve powers with the seven and five kings would appear to be echoed in the parallel in the Gospel of the Egyptians. Although in a poor and often fragmentary condition, the text appears to relate how the great angel Saklas and the great demon Nebruel begot (twelve?) assisting angels and twelve aeons for them, how Saklas called for there to be seven (archons or worlds?) and for each of the twelve to rule over his (aeon or world?). The names of the twelve follow in very close, but not identical, form to that of the long recension of the Apocryphon, with the concluding gloss that these are the ones over the underworld (and chaos?).<sup>112</sup> There are clear signs that this version is more likely to be secondary and dependent on the long recension of the Apocryphon than that it represents the original tradition echoed by the long recension and distorted by the short. Thus the presence of

Nebruel, who is associated with Saklas in the Manichean cosmogony,<sup>113</sup> might suggest that this version is post-Manichean. The close dependence of the list of twelve angels on the version in the long recension is suggested both by the similarity over the names, and over the glosses on the names, and by the fact that both – probably mistakenly – identify Adonaios with Sabaoth and apparently introduce Abel as the seventh name.<sup>114</sup> Finally the attribution in GEgypt CG III 58, 21f. to all twelve angels of the gloss applied in AJ CG II 11, 3f. to Belias, that he is over the abyss of Hell, is evidently either a secondary misunderstanding on the part of the former, or a piece of its own interpretation. It does not seem likely that the tradition common to the versions of the Apocryphon in BG, CG III and CG II, that seven kings rule over the heavens and five over the underworld,<sup>115</sup> could have been derived from the Gospel of the Egyptians version, which has all twelve over the underworld and chaos. Since in the latter the appearance of Saklas, Nebruel and the twelve angels is in response to the command that someone rule over chaos and the underworld, its gloss on the twelve may best be seen as part of its own interpretation.<sup>116</sup>

The twelve powers, we might note, do not appear to play any further part in the Apocryphon. Giversen's appeal to the later passage where Ialdabaoth plots with his powers and brings forth Fate (ἐἰρημύνη)<sup>117</sup> is unconvincing, since the powers mentioned there are most probably the seven planetary rulers who are responsible for Fate in the Poimandres.<sup>118</sup>

They come first in the list of the creations of Ialdabaoth both because they are the image of the twelve heavenly aeons, and because they represent the twelve constellations of the Zodiac which were thought in the ancient world to be part of the highest heavenly sphere, the eighth, that of the fixed stars. Beneath them come the seven planetary spheres or heavens. It may be that the ensuing mention of seven kings over the heavens, plus five underworld rulers, of whom we hear no more, was necessary as a further instance of twelve powers after the image of the heavenly duodecad. It was perhaps not surprising that the two groups should have been confused, as in the long recension of the Apocryphon. The idea of the Duodecad of heavenly beings as part of the heavenly world imitated by the Demiurge, is of course found in Valentinianism,<sup>119</sup> as is the idea, stressed by the long recension of the Apocryphon, that the Demiurge did not actually see the heavenly archetypes, but rather it was his mother's power in him which was responsible for the visible universe.<sup>120</sup> This latter may be part of the spiritualizing tendency of the long recension, but it may also suggest possible influence from Valentinianism, although Valentinianism itself may have borrowed the general mythological scheme underlying the present form of the Apocryphon and of Irenaeus adv. haer. I 29. We cannot rule out the possibility of a reciprocal process at work in texts like the Apocryphon.

(ii) The Seven Rulers

Having dealt with what has been convincingly shown to be the twelve signs of the Zodiac, or rather the twelve powers controlling them in the highest heavenly sphere, we should expect to pass to the creation and enumeration of the seven rulers of the planets, each set over a descending series of concentric spheres to each of which was assigned a planet. This is just what we appear to find in the short recension, whereas the long, as we have argued, has obscured this progression by identifying the seven planetary rulers with the first seven of the powers governing the Zodiac. Before enumerating the seven, the long also has, as indicated, the passage which has no exact parallel in the short, which first develops a digression on the topic of Ialdabaoth as an ignorant darkness.<sup>121</sup> As Giversen admits, there is not even a similar idea to this section in the short recension.<sup>122</sup> It is sparked off by the statement that Ialdabaoth gave a share of his fire but not of the power of light he had taken from his mother, because he is an ignorant darkness.<sup>123</sup> It relates how the light mingled with the darkness and caused the darkness to shine. But because of this mixture the light became darkened and became neither light nor darkness, but it became weak. This last term acts as a key-word to introduce the second half of this section, which describes the nature of the archon Ialdabaoth.<sup>124</sup> The archon who is weak, it continues, has three names. The first name is Ialtabaoth, the second is Saklas,

the third is Samael (  $\Sigma\delta\mu\alpha\eta\lambda$  ).<sup>125</sup> This is an impiety in his ignorance (  $\alpha\pi\acute{o}\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$  ), for he said: "I am God and there is no other god apart from me", since he is ignorant. He had not confirmed the place from which he had come.<sup>126</sup>

The fact that both the opening passage (CG II 11,7-10 and par.) and the closing section (11,19-22 and par.) are doublets or expansions of material found elsewhere as a unit in the long recension when it is parallel with the short;<sup>127</sup> the fact that the excursus on light and darkness has no parallel at all in the short; and the inclusion of Samael as a title which would suit the long recension's theological tendency to stress the ignorance and blindness of the Demiurge, all tend to undermine Giversen's arguments that the long recension represents a more original tradition here which the short has abridged and rearranged.<sup>128</sup> Rather the long, because it interpreted the seven planetary rulers, who were the original recipients of Ialdabaoth's fire but not his power, as the first seven of the twelve, has had to ascribe Ialdabaoth's action to the twelve. Perhaps because it felt the short recension was too brief and lacking in detail concerning Ialdabaoth/Saklas, it also inserted a description of his nature and a list of his names.<sup>129</sup>

After its reference to the seven kings set over the heavens and the five over the underworld, the short recension proceeds to give the glory-names of the seven, whereas the long simply lists the body-names



after mentioning the 365 angelic powers.<sup>130</sup> Both recensions attest that these form the hebdomad of the week,<sup>131</sup> and their role as the seven planetary rulers is strengthened by the added gloss, found only in the short recension, that it is they who control the cosmos.<sup>132</sup>

The actual names occur twice in the versions in BG and CG II, with slight variations.<sup>133</sup> Thus BG 41,18 and 43,13 have Iaoth ( Ἰάωθ ) as the first, as in the list of the twelve powers at 40,5, while CG III 17,22 has Aoth ( Ἀωθ ) as against the Haoth ( Ἠάωθ ) of 16,20, and CG II 11,26 and 12,16 retain the Athoth ( Ἀθωθ ) of 10,29. The first figure has the face or appearance ( ὡς )<sup>134</sup> of a lion according to BG 41,18 and CG III 17,22, but that of a sheep according to CG II 11,27.<sup>135</sup> BG 41,19, 43,15 and CG III 17,23 call the second Eloaios ( Ἐλωαῖος ) while CG II 11,27f. has Eloaiou ( Ἐλωαίου ) and 12,18 Eloaiō ( Ἐλωαίω ), but the versions agree in assigning the face or form of an ass to this second figure. BG 41,20 - 43,1, 43,17 and CG II 11,29 have the third as Astaphaios ( Ἀστάφαῖος ), CG III 17,24 reading Astophaeos ( Ἀστοφάεος ) and CG II 12,19 Astraphaio ( Ἀστράφαίω ). Again all agree in assigning the form of a hyena to the third figure. BG 42,2 and 43,19 and CG II 11,30 and 12,20 name the fourth figure Iao ( Ἰάω ), CG III 18,1 reading Iazo ( Ἰάζω ). But here, while BG 42,2f. and CG II 11,30 agree in assigning him the form of a snake with seven heads, CG III 18,2 gives him a lion-shaped snake ( δρῶκίωσις ) form.<sup>136</sup> The fifth

figure is named Adonaios ( ἈΔΩΝΑΙΟC ) in BG 42,3 and CG III 18,3, but Sabaoth ( CΑΒΔΩΘ ) in BG 43,20, CG II 11,31 and CG IV 19,23 and Sanbaoth ( CΑΝΒΑΔΩΘ ) in CG II 12,22.<sup>137</sup> The versions agree in assigning him a snake ( ὄφρ ἄκωC ) face.<sup>138</sup> The sixth figure is named as Adonin ( ἈΔΩΝΙΝ ) in CG III 18,4f. and CG II 11,32, Adoni ( ἈΔΩΝΙ ) in BG 42,5 and Adonein ( ἈΔΩΝΕΙΝ ) in CG II 12,23.<sup>139</sup> Once more the versions agree in giving him an ape-face. Finally the seventh figure is named Sabbataios ( CΑΒΒΑΤΑΙΟC ) by BG 42,6 and 44,4, Sabbadaios ( CΑΒΒΑΔΑΙΟC ) by CG III 18,6, Sabbede ( CΑΒΒΕΔΕ ) by CG II 11,23 and Sabbateon ( CΑΒΒΑΤΕΩΝ ) by CG II 12,25. This last is generally described as having a gleaming fiery face.

Although four of these names can be found in the list of twelve (Iaoth/Athoth, Adonaios, Sabaoth, Adonin), a much closer parallel occurs in the names of the seven heavenly rulers or hebdomad given by Irenaeus in his account of the Ophites (Ialdabaoth, Iao, Sabaoth, Adoneus, Eloeus, Oreus, Astaphaeus);<sup>140</sup> by Origen in his description of the Ophian passwords when ascending or descending through the seven heavens each with its archon (Ialdabaoth, Iao, Sabaoth (Adonaios), Astaphaios, Ailoiios, Horaios);<sup>141</sup> and by the Untitled Treatise from Codex II which has Ialdabaoth (or "Ariel" because he was lion-like) first create Iao (Ἰᾶω), Eloai (ελωαῖ) and Astaphaios (ἈCΤΑΦΑΙΟC),<sup>142</sup> as in the Apocryphon, but then

breaks off and gives another list of seven androgynous beings of whom the male names are identical to those of Irenaeus' list ( (Ialdabaoth), Iao, Sabaoth, Adonaios, Eloaios, Oraios, Astaphaios).<sup>143</sup> The first of these is referred to as "the hebdomad", and the female names are a list of abstract characteristics (providence, lordship, divinity etc.) which closely correspond to the seven powers in the Apocryphon which are later combined with the seven heavenly rulers.<sup>144</sup> Finally we might note that the oval jasper pendant among the amulets published by Campbell Bonner has on its obverse a lion-headed god with the names Ialdabaoth ( Ἰαλδαβαοθ ) and Ariel ( Ἀριελ ) inscribed on either side, and on its reverse the names of the seven archons again in the order given by Irenaeus ( Ἰα, Ἰαω, Ἐαβαωθ, Ἀδωναι, Ἐλωα, Ὑπερος, Ἀσταφειος ).<sup>145</sup>

The close similarities tend to confirm the hypothesis that the seven heavenly rulers of the Apocryphon are to be identified with the seven heavens and the seven planets, which they control. The differences would appear to be explicable in terms of two different lists or independent but partially overlapping traditions of names, one of which included Ialdabaoth as one of the seven, the other of which had him as the creator of the seven. The Untitled Treatise tends to confirm this by the way it begins with the latter but then abandons it and presents the former. As Welburn has suggested, Origen's account may supply the key to understanding the Apocryphon's list,<sup>146</sup> but it may also furnish the link

between the two traditions, that found in the Apocryphon and that found in Irenaeus, the Untitled Treatise and the Gnostic amulet.

First on the matter of the appearance of the seven, Origen quotes Celsus' list and the corresponding one in the Ophian diagram which he has. Celsus' list has the first archontic demon formed in the shape of a lion, whom Origen's list names as Michael, the lion-like (λεοντοειδής). Celsus' second demon was in the shape of a bull, named by Origen's diagram as Suriel and bull-like. Celsus' third demon was double and hissed dreadfully, named Raphael by Origen's diagram and described as snake-like (δρακοντοειδής). Celsus' fourth had the form (γοργόν) of an eagle, named Gabriel by Origen's diagram and eagle-like. Celsus' fifth had the face (πρόσωπον) of a bear, named Thauthabaoth by Origen's diagram and described as bear-like. Celsus' sixth had the face of a dog, called Erathaoth by Origen's diagram. Finally Celsus' seventh had the face of an ass and was called Thaphabaoth or Onoel in his diagram, but was named Onoel or Thartharaoth in Origen's copy and described as ass-like.<sup>147</sup> The animal-forms are of course not identical with those of the Apocryphon (although the two texts share the lion (in the case of the short recension), the snake, the dog or hyena, and the ass), and the names are completely different, but we should note the fact that in both the short recension of the Apocryphon and the diagrams of Celsus and Origen, the first archontic demon is leonine.

In the following chapter Origen lists the Ophian formulae which allow the descending Gnostic to pass unscathed through the sphere of the ogdoad and then through the seven heavens in descending order.<sup>148</sup> That this is the correct interpretation is confirmed by the fact that Ialdabaoth, the first archon to be met, is called first and seventh, and that Saturn ( ὁ Φαίνομενος ), the outermost planet, is in sympathy with the lion-like archon (i.e. Ialdabaoth). Now the seventh heavenly ruler in the Apocryphon is Sabbataios who has a gleaming, fiery appearance (i.e. he is equated with ὁ Φαίνομενος ), and the Apocryphon goes on at once to call him (and the other six) the hebdomad of the week ( ἑβδόμη αἰών ). As Welburn has pointed out, Sabbataios is in all probability a transcription of the Hebrew for Saturn, Shabbathai, and thus we have here a play on the Hebrew for "Lord of Hosts", "seven" and "Saturn". Thus Tacitus associated Saturn with the God of the Jews.<sup>149</sup> Bullard also notes the common identification of Saturn and Ialdabaoth and the fact that Saturn was represented as a lion in Mithraic art.<sup>150</sup>

Passing through the first, i.e. seventh, sphere of Ialdabaoth and Saturn, the Gnostic comes to the following lower sphere of Iao who is said to shine by night. This must refer to Jupiter, and certainly the Adonin or Adoni which comes sixth in the Apocryphon could represent a synonym of Iao, the form of the Jewish tetragrammaton found in magical and Gnostic texts. Sabaoth, the third in Origen's list and

fifth in the Apocryphon, is evidently to be associated with Mars and the fifth heaven. Welburn, in discussing the snake-form attributed to Sabaoth, alludes to the idea of the seraphim as fiery serpents assigned to Mars.<sup>151</sup> Origen's list has omitted the archon of the fourth heaven, Adonaios, at this point, but he refers to the name in the following chapter.<sup>152</sup> Since Adonaios would appear to represent, or be associated with the Sun, his omission might be regarded as understandable. The form in the Apocryphon, Iao (or Iazo) could also be regarded as a readily comprehensible synonym, particularly since we have already had the forms Adonin and Adonaios (in the short recension at least). Welburn's suggestion that the snake with seven heads is a condensed and exact symbol for the Sun as the great luminary of the natural and material cosmos who supplies the other six with power and light, is an attractive one.<sup>153</sup> Astaphaios, the ruler of the third gate in Origen's list, is also third in the Apocryphon's scheme and is evidently to be associated with Venus, while Ailoeus, the archon of the second gate is clearly identical to the Eloaios who is second in the Apocryphon's list, and must be linked with Mercury. Finally we have Horaios, the archon of the first gate in Origen's account, who must be associated with the last and lowest planetary sphere, that of the Moon.

In the Apocryphon, however, the first heavenly ruler is Iaoth (BG) or Athoth (CG II) who has a lion-face (BG and CG III) or a

sheep-face (CG II). But if we accept the evidence of Origen and the arguments of Welburn, this ruler must be identified with the Moon, and the Apocryphon has listed the planetary rulers starting from the lowest planetary sphere, that of the Moon, and working up to the highest and furthest away, that of Saturn, precisely the reverse of Origen's procedure. Why, then, do we have Iaoth or Athoth instead of Horaios or something similar? Part of the reason may lie in the tendency, seen particularly in the long recension but perhaps also present in the short, to equate the twelve powers with the seven and five kings. Thus the first name was retained in the case of the second list. As for the different animal forms, we have noted the fact that the first archon in the diagrams of Celsus and Origen had the form or appearance of a lion. Furthermore, according to Welburn's reconstruction, the first of the twelve zodiacal signs must be Leo.<sup>154</sup> This evidence may help to explain why the short recension ascribes the face of a lion to the first heavenly ruler. Thus the long recension may here preserve a more original reading.<sup>155</sup>

The persistent tradition represented by Irenaeus' account of the Ophites, the Untitled Treatise from Codex II and the Gnostic amulet, which begins with Ialdabaoth and has Astaphaios last, evidently represents an independent development which does not apparently correspond to the normal arrangement of the planets, but has Venus last. In this tradition, which Origen also attests, Ialdabaoth is either



associated with, or even identified as, the planet Saturn.<sup>156</sup> Astaphaios/  
 Venus may have been placed last either because Venus alone was  
 female, and thus inferior or deficient in Gnostic eyes, or because of  
 the frequency with which the four Jewish divine names (Iao, Sabaoth,  
 Adonai, Elohim) occur together in non-Jewish, particularly magic,  
 texts. Thus Origen states that the Gnostics took from the Hebrew  
 scriptures the names Iao (יְהוָה), Sabaoth, Adonaios and Eloaios  
 (and the others from magic).<sup>157</sup>

Parallels to the Apocryphon's scheme of the Demiurge producing  
 seven planetary rulers each assigned to one of the seven heavens can  
 be found in the Poimandres, where the Nous Demiurge fashioned seven  
 governors who embrace the perceptible world in circles, their govern-  
 ment being called "fate" or "destiny" (ἐξουσίαν),<sup>158</sup> but perhaps  
 more significantly in the Ptolemean system described by Irenaeus.  
 He relates how, according to them, the Demiurge prepared seven  
 heavens above which he was to dwell, for which reason he was named  
 Hebdomad. The seven heavens are intelligible (νοητός /intellectualis),  
 and are held to be angels, the Demiurge himself being also an angel  
 like God.<sup>159</sup> However, the Ptolemeans would appear to have had  
 different names for these angels than those found in the Apocryphon,  
 since the fourth archangel is called "Paradise".<sup>160</sup>

The Apocryphon, stimulated by the reference to the various  
 forms of appearance of the seven, relates how Ialdabaoth (the short

recension adds: "Saklas") has a host of forms (  $\mu\sigma\rho\phi\eta$  BG; CG III;  $\pi\rho\sigma\sigma\omega\pi\sigma\nu$  CG II) so as to appear in every form (20) as he wishes.<sup>161</sup> He gave the seven a share of his fire but not of the pure light, the power which he had seized from his mother.<sup>162</sup> He was lord over them precisely because of the glory in him of the power of light of the Mother (BG) or glory of the light of the power which is in him of the Mother (CG III) or the power of the glory of his mother, which is light for him (CG II).<sup>163</sup> For this reason, too, he called himself "God" thereby disobeying the substance or reality (  $\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\upsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$  ) from which he had originated (short recension), or the place from which he had come (long recension).<sup>164</sup> This arrogant claim of the Demiurge to be God is found in Valentinianism as is the term "substance", although nowhere is it expressly said that he was disobedient to it.<sup>165</sup>

### (iii) The Seven Powers

The Apocryphon then proceeds to relate how Ialdabaoth combined with the authorities (  $\epsilon\tilde{\xi}\sigma\upsilon\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$  , i.e. the seven heavenly rulers) seven powers which originated from the fact that he spoke.<sup>166</sup> He named them, beginning from above.<sup>167</sup> To each of the seven rulers named in the form described above is ascribed a quality which is a Greek or Coptic feminine noun with one exception, but while the list of these in CG II 12, 15-25 is identical with the second enumeration of them in CG II 15, 14-23, that in BG 43, 11 - 44, 4 differs slightly from

its counterpart at BG 49,11 - 50,4, which itself is virtually identical with the parallel in CG III 22,19 - 23,6.<sup>168</sup> Furthermore both recensions differ from each other. Thus BG 43,12f. has Pronoia (  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\nu\epsilon\iota\alpha$  ) with the first, Iaoth, but Pronoia comes fourth in BG 49,16 and CG III 23,1f., while it is second (with Eloaio) in CG II 12,17f. and CG II 15,15f. (= CG IV 24,4f.). The change of position of Pronoia, however, is the only difference in order in the three versions in the short recension, and the remaining order is Divinity (  $\mu\bar{\nu}\tau\eta\sigma\gamma\tau\theta$  ) second with Eloaios in BG 43,14f., first in BG 49,11; Goodness ( ?  $\mu\bar{\nu}\tau\chi\bar{\zeta}$  ) third with Astaphaios in BG 43,15-17 and second in BG 49,13, although the parallel in CG III 22,21 appears to read "Lordship" (  $\mu\bar{\nu}\tau\lambda[\theta\epsilon\iota\zeta]$  ), and Till has corrected his translation of BG in line with CG III at this point;<sup>169</sup> Fire (  $\kappa\omega\tau$  ) fourth with Iao in BG 43,17-19 and third in BG 49,14f. and CG III 22,22f. (which appears to read  $[\kappa\alpha\gamma]\mu\lambda$  ); Kingdom (  $\mu\bar{\nu}\tau\bar{\rho}\bar{\rho}\theta$  ) fifth with Sabaoth in BG 43,19f. and fifth in BG 49,19 and CG III 23,2f.; [Insight?] sixth with Adoni in BG 44,1f. and sixth in BG 50,2 (  $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu[\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma]$  ) and CG III 23,4 (  $[\zeta\gamma]\eta\zeta\epsilon\zeta\iota\zeta$  ); Wisdom (  $\sigma\phi\acute{\iota}\sigma$  ) seventh with Sabbataios in BG 44,3f. and seventh in BG 50,4 and CG III 23,5.

The long recension presents a much less ambiguous picture. It has Goodness (  $\mu\bar{\nu}\tau\chi\bar{\rho}\zeta$  ) first with Athoth, the interpretation of the abbreviation being confirmed by CG II 15,14 where the full form (  $\mu\bar{\nu}\tau\chi\rho\eta\zeta\tau\theta\zeta$  ) is given. Pronoia is second as indicated, then

comes Divinity third with Astaphaios in CG II 12,18f. and third in CG II 15,17 (= CG IV 24,7). Lordship (  $\overline{\text{MNT}}\Delta\text{O}\epsilon\iota\epsilon$  ) is fourth with Iao in CG II 12,19f. and fourth in CG II 15,18; Kingdom (  $\overline{\text{MNT}}\epsilon\rho\text{o}$  ) is fifth with Sabaoth in CG II 12,21f. and fifth in CG II 15,19f. (= CG IV 24,10); Envy (?  $\kappa\omega\alpha$  ) is sixth with Adonein in CG II 12,22f. and sixth in CG II 15,21, while Prudence (  $\overline{\text{MNT}}\rho\overline{\text{MNT}}\iota\eta\tau$  , i.e.  $\sigma\upsilon\psi\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$  ?<sup>170</sup>) is seventh with Sabbateon in CG II 12,24f. and seventh in CG II 15,22 (= CG IV 24,13).

However, the second enumeration is complicated by the fact that it allots to each power the creation of one of the seven psychic substances of the body. In this case both recensions appear to preserve the same order: bone, sinew, flesh, marrow, blood, skin, hair, although one might have expected the order found in a Zoroastrian text cited by R.C. Zaehner<sup>171</sup>: marrow (associated with the Moon), bones (associated with Mercury), flesh (associated with Venus), sinews (associated with the Sun), veins (associated with Mars), skin (associated with Jupiter) and hair (associated with Saturn). This order works from the innermost to the outermost, and some awareness of this may be shown by BG's version which has Pronoia, which is responsible for the marrow, first in its first list. Furthermore, we must take into account the very similar list of female names given to the seven heavenly powers in the Untitled Treatise from Codex II: Pronoia (Sambathas), Lordship (  $\overline{\text{MNT}}\Delta\epsilon\iota\epsilon$  ), Divinity,

Kingdom, Envy ( כּוֹז ) Riches ( ? [מִנְתְּרִין] מֵאֵל ) and Wisdom ( חֵכֶם ).<sup>172</sup>

Lastly, there is the quotation in Theodore bar Konai from an Apocalypse in the name of John, which Puech thinks is identical with our Apocryphon, and which was supposedly written by a schismatic Edessene deacon, Audi, and used by his followers, the heretical sect of the Audians.<sup>173</sup>

This has Audi say of the powers from which comes his body: "My Wisdom made the hair, Understanding the skin, Elohim made the bones, and my Sovereignty made the blood, Adonai made the nerves and Zeal made the flesh and Thought made the marrow". These ideas, Theodore maintains, Audi got from "the Chaldeans" i.e. astrologers.<sup>174</sup>

The Apocryphon is certainly in a confused state. First of all, both recensions assert that Ialdabaoth began from above although, if we accept Welburn's attribution of the names and the Zoroastrian and other parallels, he began with the ruler of the lowest sphere, that of the Moon. Secondly, as indicated, one would have expected him to start with the marrow and work outwards, rather than have the marrow fourth and separated from the bones.<sup>175</sup> Thirdly, there is the masculine term Zeal or Fire ( כּוֹז / כּוֹזִי ) which occurs in a neuter form in CG III ( [כּוֹזִי] מֵאֵל ) despite the fact that all the rest are feminine.<sup>176</sup> It may be that the version in the long recension is more consistent and clearly distinguishes "Goodness" and "Lordship" in a way which the short does not appear to,<sup>177</sup> but on the other hand,

the version in BG appears to be aware that Pronoia who creates the marrow did once come first. Furthermore, the term "Goodness" does not occur either in Theodore bar Konai's list, nor in the similar list in the Untitled Treatise, whereas  $\sigma\omicron\phi\iota\varsigma$  or its equivalent does, and both of these lists, like that of the short recension of the Apocryphon, attest a sequence which has Pronoia or equivalent and  $\sigma\omicron\phi\iota\varsigma$  or equivalent at either end. The attribution of bodily parts and powers preserved by Theodore bar Konai's quotation also reproduces that in the short recension, although this may be because the Audians possessed versions based on it rather than on the long. Moreover, one could explain why the creation of the marrow comes fourth in the list better from the short recension than from the long. Thus Pronoia occurs first in the first enumeration,<sup>just</sup> as she is the female name of the first androgynous archon (Ialdabaoth) in the list in the Untitled Treatise from Codex II, who is later apparently responsible for creating the marrow.<sup>178</sup> The redactor of the short recension, however, aware that Iaoth in fact represented the Moon, may have felt the need to transfer the Pronoia as creator of the marrow to fourth place, the sphere associated with the Sun, the most powerful and important of the planets. Finally, against Giversen, it could be argued that the long recension has omitted Wisdom ( $\sigma\omicron\phi\iota\varsigma$ ) as the last power, perhaps under the mistaken impression that its final name,  $\mu\bar{\nu}\tau\rho\mu\bar{\nu}\lambda\eta\tau$ , stood for  $\sigma\omicron\phi\iota\varsigma$  rather than  $\sigma\upsilon\upsilon\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ .

Thus it was compelled to add another power and inserted "Goodness" as the first.<sup>179</sup>

Finally we have the passage alluded to above in which the long recension has its account of the double names of these powers, the one series given them by the Archigenetor whereby they are powerful, the other given according to the glory of the non-heavenly ones, whereby they become impotent.<sup>180</sup> This passage, we suggested, broke the continuity of the short and had been displaced from its original context. That context in BG had been the mention of the twelve zodiacal constellations and involved glory names given by the heavenly ones. Here BG's version allots the seven powers a firmament (στρωμένον) in each heaven and an aeon after the aeon-pattern which existed from the beginning in the type (τύπος) of the imperishable ones.<sup>181</sup> The long recension, however, has them possess a firmament in each aeon-heaven, and then branches out into the passage on the names.<sup>182</sup> The linking of "aeon" with "heaven" does not make much sense, and its original association is clearly with the passage which follows the two-names section, which speaks of the Demiurge creating everything "in the image of the first aeons which originated in order to create them in the form of the imperishable ones".<sup>183</sup> The further correction in the long recension to the effect that Ialdabaoth did not actually see the imperishable realm but that it was the power of his mother in him which produced the image of the (heavenly) cosmos, is also evidently



secondary, another instance of the "spiritualizing" tendency of the long recension, perhaps to some extent influenced by Valentinian ideas.<sup>184</sup>

Of this whole section of the creation and naming of the twelve zodiacal powers, the seven planetary rulers with their seven powers and the five kings of the underworld, Irenaeus appears at first sight to give little or no indication. However, he does refer<sup>185</sup> to the Protarchon creating first the powers (potestas i.e. ἐξουσία ?) which are under him, which has a clear parallel in the short recension (BG 39,6f. = CG III 16,8f.), but not in the long, then angels, which could refer to the twelve angels mentioned with the powers in the short recension, or to the following total of 360, or even perhaps to the seven planetary rulers.<sup>186</sup> Again, the short recension would appear more closely related to Irenaeus' account than the long, which has separated the list of angels from the twelve powers. The firmaments (firmamenta) then mentioned by Irenaeus may correspond to the firmaments assigned to the seven powers in the Apocryphon.<sup>187</sup> Finally Irenaeus refers to the creation of all earthly things. This, of course, has not yet taken place or been explicitly described by the Apocryphon.

Again, in a passage which appears to have no parallel in the Apocryphon, Irenaeus relates how the Protarchon united with Presumption ( Ἀυθάδεια : Authadia) and begot Wickedness ( κακία ), Envy

(Zelus), Jealousy (Phthonus), Revenge (Erinnys) and Passion (Epithymia).<sup>188</sup> Carl Schmidt argued that these can only be understood as the five rulers of chaos and the underworld whose names probably dropped out of the Apocryphon.<sup>189</sup> This is an attractive suggestion, and certainly the origin of evil and of the underworld and its rulers would fit better at this point in the Apocryphon than earlier. The tendency to identify the seven planetary rulers and five kings of the underworld with the twelve zodiacal powers may have led the redactors of the Apocryphon to move the five rulers to their present position.<sup>190</sup> Certainly, as already indicated, they appear rather abruptly and play no further part, although the Apocryphon's reference to them suggests it has some further knowledge concerning them. This tendency shown by both the Apocryphon and Irenaeus' account of the Barbelognostics to make Ialdabaoth responsible for evil aligns these texts with works like the Hypostasis of the Archons, the Untitled Treatise from Codex II, the Gospel of the Egyptians, the Apocalypse of Adam etc., rather than the systems of the Ophites and the Ptolemean school of Valentinianism, which relieve the Demiurge from such a role and make his Satanic son responsible.<sup>191</sup>

(c) Ialdabaoth's arrogant boast and Sophia's repentance

Irenaeus' account of the Barbelognostic system concludes with the reaction of Sophia to her son's generation of the five evil powers, her withdrawal above and his arrogant boast that he alone is God. Full

of grief, she withdrew to the higher regions and became for those counting from below the Ogdoad (octonatio). After she had withdrawn he thought that he was alone (or "alone existed"? se solum opinatum esse) and for this reason said: "I am a jealous (zelator) god (Exod. 20:5) and beside me there is no-one" (Is. 45:5; 46:9).<sup>192</sup>

The Apocryphon, however, presents a different order and conception of these events. At this point it places the arrogant boast of Ialdabaoth that he alone is God, but what sparks this off is his gazing at the creation surrounding him and the host of angels around him who had come into existence from him, whereupon he says to them: "I am a jealous (  $\bar{\text{N}}\rho\epsilon\gamma\kappa\omega\lambda$  ) god, beside me there is none" (BG), or "I, I am a jealous (  $\bar{\text{N}}\rho\epsilon\gamma\kappa\omega\lambda$  ) god, and there is no other god apart from me" (CG II and IV).<sup>193</sup> To make this identification of Ialdabaoth with the God of the Old Testament (and of the Jews of course) doubly clear, it adds the ironic comment, pointing up the folly of such exclusivist claims, that in doing this Ialdabaoth had immediately indicated to the angels under him that another god existed, for otherwise he would have no object for his jealousy.<sup>194</sup> This identification also serves to mark the beginning of the Apocryphon's reinterpretation or "correction" of the opening chapters of Genesis, which provides the backbone of its anthropology and soteriology.

Sophia's reaction thus comes later, after Ialdabaoth's boast, and is interpreted differently from Irenaeus' version. It is first seen in

terms of the going-to-and-fro of the spirit of God in Gen. 1:2b LXX (ἐπιφειλέσθαι),<sup>195</sup> which is suitably reinterpreted, the reasons being her realisation of her deficiency in acting without her consort as well as her awareness of the wickedness, apostasy and imperfection of her son.<sup>196</sup> Thus she is said to have repented, and her lament was heard by her brothers whose plea for help was granted by the invisible Spirit.<sup>197</sup> The recensions disagree over whether her consort was sent down to her, but agree that she was led up to the Ninth (or Ennead?), rather than being the Ogdoad as in Irenaeus, until she perfected her deficiency.<sup>198</sup>

Carl Schmidt had argued that the fact that Sophia's repentance comes after Ialdabaoth's boast in the Apocryphon suggested that the work excerpted by Irenaeus extended beyond the point where he concluded.<sup>199</sup> Schenke, however, pointed to the differences in motivation etc. sketched above between the two accounts and the appropriateness of Irenaeus' order of events, as weakening Schmidt's hypothesis, and he also appealed to the existence of a literary suture at BG 44,19, precisely where Irenaeus' excerpt ended, to support his view that Irenaeus summarised a complete work.<sup>200</sup> Schenke's claim of a literary suture has been criticised by Schottroff<sup>201</sup> on the grounds that the contradictions detected by him between the first and second parts of the Apocryphon do not necessarily prove a suture at this point, since there are similar contradictions within each part. However, the

important point he made was to note the appropriateness of Sophia's repentance prior to Ialdabaoth's boast in Irenaeus' account. Schottroff herself has also given a valuable analysis of this section of the Apocryphon dealing with Sophia's repentance and elevation, which suggests the secondary character of much of it,<sup>202</sup> and this is of great help in determining whether the Apocryphon's order is the more original.

Thus the Apocryphon repeats the theme of the hubris of the Demiurge and the repentance of the Mother,<sup>203</sup> inserting into the first example a question by John to the Saviour on the meaning of "to go to-and-fro", which Schottroff would see as a piece of polemical exegesis ("correcting" what "Moses" said) added later and giving rise to the repetition.<sup>204</sup> As regards the relation of the versions in this section, while both BG and the long recension have the Mother go to-and-fro since she recognised her deficiency (BG) or the deficiencies (CG II),<sup>205</sup> they disagree over the nature of that deficiency. BG sees it as lying in the fact that since her consort had not agreed with (  $\sigma \cup \phi \omega \nu \epsilon \nu$  ) her she was degraded in her perfection,<sup>206</sup> while the long recension, in an evident attempt to remove the sexual overtones, simply speaks of it in terms of the brightness of her light being diminished and her becoming dark because her consort had not agreed with her.<sup>207</sup> Again BG 45,6f. has John address the Revealer/Redeemer as "Christ" (  $\pi \epsilon \chi \rho \iota$  ) while CG II 13,17f. prefers "Lord" (  $\pi \alpha \omicron \tau \epsilon \iota \varsigma$  ). As Wilson has noted, in all the

ten questions John asks, BG reads "Christ", while in each case CG III has "Lord", a reading supported in nine cases by CG II and in several by CG IV.<sup>208</sup> The answer to his question about which form is original is that in all probability, the latter, since BG betrays a consistent tendency in both the Apocryphon and the Sophia of Jesus Christ which follows it to read "Christ" where the versions of the Apocryphon, the Sophia and Eugnostos in CG III read "Lord".<sup>209</sup> The Greek original of one passage in the Sophia confirms the priority of "Lord" (  $\chi\omicron\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  /  $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$  ).<sup>210</sup> Again, BG 45,11-13 speaks of Sophia seeing the wickedness (  $\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha$  ) and apostasy (  $\alpha\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha$  ) which would befall her son in the future, whereas the long recension (CG II 13,21-3; IV 21,8-10), probably correctly, refers to the wickedness which had happened and the theft her son had committed.<sup>211</sup> The assertion in the long recension that oblivion (  $\beta\acute{\upsilon}\lambda\eta$  ) overtook her may be an addition on its part.<sup>212</sup>

Sophia's going to-and-fro, which is only unequivocally interpreted as an allusion to Genesis 1:2b LXX by the Saviour's reply to John that it was not as "Moses" said "over the waters",<sup>213</sup> is understood by the Apocryphon as her restless movement in the darkness of ignorance and her feeling ashamed and not daring to return.<sup>214</sup> Schenke has argued that this whole mythological motif was developed from an original allegorical interpretation of Gen. 1:2 and attempted to sketch this process by appeal to the various interpretations of the

verse by the Valentinians, the Untitled Treatise from Codex II and the Ophite system outlined by Irenaeus.<sup>215</sup> Schottroff, however, has questioned Schenke's hypothesis and has argued that what we have here is the mythological topos of the wandering Sophia, whose associations with the Ennoia/Helen figure of Irenaeus' account of Simon Magus, the soul in the Naassene Preaching etc., and whose possible origin in the idea of Wisdom's sojourn on earth (I Enoch 42, 1-3) she has examined.<sup>216</sup>

The second reference to Sophia's repentance which immediately follows,<sup>217</sup> may confirm the hypothesis that this whole digression and anti-Jewish "correction" of Genesis may not be original and that it was developed to link the repentance of Sophia with the Gnostic reinterpretation of Genesis which now follows, and which proceeds by a new format, that of the disciple's question and the Revealer/Redeemer's answer. Thus we have a repetition of the taking by Ialdabaoth, here described as "the self-willed" (  $\alpha\upsilon\theta\alpha\delta\eta's$  ),<sup>218</sup> of power from his mother and his ignorance of any power apart from her.<sup>219</sup> He sees the host of angels whom he had created and exalts himself above them. When the Mother realises that the abortion (BG) or cover (CG II) of darkness was not perfect because her consort had not concurred with her, she repents and weeps.<sup>220</sup> This presentation is evidently more primitive and mythological, preserving the idea, which the long recension tries to play down, that Sophia's fault



was basically sexual; her production of the abortion. Ialdabaoth without her partner. It also suggests that he is aware of her existence in his realm.

As a final cosmological development, we have the partial restoration of Sophia to the realm of the Ninth, but the two recensions differ over what happens. According to the short, Sophia's brothers plead for her, the holy invisible Spirit nods assent (κατανεύειν) and pours a spirit over her from the perfection (πλήρωμα CG III; ΔΩΚ BG). Her consort (σύζυγος) descended to her to correct her (CG III reads "their") deficiencies (υπα). He resolved through providence (πρόνοια) to do this and she was not brought up to her aeon, but because of the ignorance which had appeared in her, she is in the Ninth until she corrects her deficiency.<sup>221</sup> The two versions of the long recension,<sup>222</sup> which usually demonstrate a high degree of unanimity, appear to differ at one or two points in this passage. Both agree word for word that the whole perfection or Pleroma (πλήρωμα) of the invisible virginal Spirit blessed her,<sup>223</sup> but CG II 14,5f. then has the holy Spirit shed over her (something?) from their whole Pleroma while CG IV 22,5f., according to Krause's reconstruction, reads: "And [he was] amazed (or "nodded assent" (εἰωρεμ)) in the Sp[irit]."<sup>224</sup> Now (δέ) from their whole Pleroma a[nd] the li[fe] (from here CG IV and CG II correspond) her consort did not come to her but he (or "it"?) came down to her through

the Pleroma to correct her deficiency".<sup>225</sup> All four texts then agree that she was not brought up to her own heaven, the long recension continuing: "but (she was brought up) to the heaven of her son, so that she should remain in the Ninth (CG IV 22, 14 adds "heaven") till she correct her deficiency (ὡς τὰ)." <sup>226</sup> The confusion present in the long recension at this point; its denial that the consort descended followed by its insistence that someone or something did descend, and its omission of the mention of Sophia's ignorance all suggest that it is secondary here, as Schottroff also argues.<sup>227</sup> Giversen advances the plausible conjecture that the long recension made the alterations to play down the anthropomorphic features of this passage.<sup>228</sup>

It is surely striking that on at least three occasions when Sophia's consort is mentioned the long recension has attempted to play down or obscure his role. When the consort is described as "the male virginal Spirit" in the short recension,<sup>229</sup> the long paraphrases that as "the aspect (πρὸς ὧν ἵεν) of her maleness"<sup>230</sup>; at this point the long denies her consort descends; and later when the short recension speaks of how the consort of the Mother will be or was sent out to raise her up,<sup>231</sup> the long is very confused over who the consort is and finally insists it was Sophia herself who descended in guilelessness to correct her deficiency.<sup>232</sup>

The whole pattern of Sophia's repentance, the request of her brothers or the Pleroma to the supreme being, and the descent of a

consort to perfect her deficiency, recalls Valentinian language and conceptions,<sup>233</sup> which might be further support for the hypothesis that the Apocryphon influenced Valentinianism, but if so, it is surely significant that Valentinianism derived the Demiurge from the passions and repentance of Sophia. This might add more weight to the hypothesis that, as in Irenaeus' account of the Barbelognostics,<sup>234</sup> and in the Trimorphic Protennoia,<sup>235</sup> Sophia's repentance and partial restoration may originally have come before Ialdabaoth's boast. Again the idea that Sophia is in the Ninth (i.e. ἐννέης,<sup>236</sup>), rather than in or as the Eighth (ὀγδοάς ; octonatio), as in the Barbelognostic account, Valentinianism etc.,<sup>237</sup> may be a secondary feature. Thus Schottroff, in an excursus on this idea, suggests that this is the heavenly region above Ialdabaoth and the seven archons, but below the Pleroma, which represents the Ogdoad in other systems.<sup>238</sup> The long recension has evidently attempted to clarify the situation in that it speaks of the seven rulers as over the seventh heaven,<sup>239</sup> and has Sophia in the heaven of, i.e. above, her son.<sup>240</sup> There is some evidence for the Demiurge being called "Ogdoad".<sup>241</sup> The heavenly realms of the Eighth (ὀγδοάς) and Ninth (ἐννέης) in the Hermetic treatise from Codex VI are probably not an exact parallel since they represent the highest heavens and not an intermediate region.<sup>242</sup>

### Conclusion

On the question of the original form of the Apocryphon and the

priority of the versions, we have attempted to demonstrate that Giversen's thesis of the priority of the version in CG II does not explain the clear differences between the recensions in this section over the order of events and the number and nature of the powers created by Ialdabaoth. The evidence suggests that it is the short recension which has remained closer to the original order of events and interpretation of the powers and angels. The long recension, as is evident from the doublets and expansions, the passages unique to it (the mixture of light and darkness etc.) and the tendency to present a more spiritual interpretation (e.g. Ialdabaoth not seeing the heavenly world, Sophia's consort not actually descending, etc.), has obscured and altered the original order. Its evident equation of the twelve zodiacal powers with their 360 angels with the seven planetary rulers and five kings of the underworld, and its insistence on its own tradition of 365 angels who are responsible for the creation of the individual members of Adam, has led it to change the order of events, alter the numbers of angels, add doublets, and obscure the nature of the various heavenly beings involved. Over against this, the short recension presents a logical and reasonably comprehensible order which makes clear the nature of the twelve zodiacal powers and seven planetary rulers and the distinction between them.

From the overlappings and inconsistencies present in the various lists of names and characteristics, it is evident that the Apocryphon

has taken over existing traditions concerning the signs of the Zodiac and planetary rulers without complete understanding. It also clearly presupposes or alludes to a great deal which is left unexplained. Thus the five rulers of the underworld, who are only mentioned in passing, may bear some relation to the five evil beings generated by the Pro-tarchon in Irenaeus' account. We must not overlook the importance of the theological tendency (or tendencies) of a work like the Apocryphon (or Irenaeus adv. haer. I 29) which determines what from an extensive stock of mythological motifs it is to select to express its own point of view. Thus the repetitive nature of the passage dealing with Ialdabaoth's boast and Sophia's repentance and the way her repentance is made to introduce the following section, the Gnostic reinterpretation or "correction" of Genesis, yet immediately repeat its more primitive sexual context, point both to the Apocryphon's tendency to tone down or obscure the more original mythological motif and to the possibility it has altered a more original order which (as in Irenaeus adv. haer. I 29 and in Valentinianism) put Sophia's repentance before her son's boast. The slightly artificial nature of the allusion which initiates the Genesis reinterpretation might therefore add some support to Schenke's thesis that this first half of the Apocryphon once formed an independent cosmogony, to which the work summarised by Irenaeus was closely related.<sup>243</sup>

In answer to the question of the relation of the various versions

of the Apocryphon to adv.hacr. I 29, we would therefore argue that although the resemblances are much more limited in this section, they do exist, and that the differences can be explained more satisfactorily if we posit that the system summarised by Irenaeus represents an earlier, more primitive and less developed form of that found in our Apocryphon, which although frequently drawing on the same traditions, represents a different theological tendency and has made use of material not present in the former. Furthermore we cannot overlook the fact that Irenaeus is condensing and that his selection is governed by the need to point up parallels with Valentinianism, since his thesis is that the latter is derived from systems like that of the Barbelognostics and Ophites. The other parallel material either appears to be to some extent dependent on the Apocryphon, and in particular on its long recension (e.g. the twelve powers or angels in the Gospel of the Egyptians, the names and nature of Ialdabaoth in the Trimorphic Protennoia), or to represent an allied but independent tradition (e.g. the names and characteristics of the seven heavenly rulers in the Untitled Treatise from Codex II) which includes Ialdabaoth among the seven. The similarities between the list of powers and characteristics in the Audian Apocalypse of John and that of the version in the Apocryphon in BG might attest the influence of the short recension. Certainly, as was true of the earlier section in the Apocryphon on the heavenly world (dealt with in the previous chapter), it is the short recension

which is closer to adv. haer. I 29 at the points where some similarity is demonstrable.

As regards the questions of Christianization or de-Christianization and the possible influence of the Apocryphon on Valentinianism, there is little evidence of either of the former processes, unless one considers the passage on the mixture of light and darkness in the long recension (CG II 11, 10-15 and par.) a commentary on John 1:5, and thus a sign of greater Christianization on the part of the long over against the short. But the passage appears to bear little relation to John's Gospel, and reflects a common Gnostic motif.<sup>244</sup> There is, however, perhaps more evidence to suggest a kinship with, or even perhaps possible influence on, Valentinianism. Thus we have Sophia's creation without her partner; the description of her offspring (in BG) as an abortion; Ialdabaoth's creation in the image of the heavenly world (the twelve and the seven); his boast that he alone is God; the pattern of Sophia's repentance, her brothers in the Pleroma pleading for her and her consort descending to correct her deficiency, and finally the concept of one Sophia and the negative evaluation of the Demiurge found in Theodotus and probably Valentinus himself.<sup>245</sup>



Notes to Chapter Two

1. BG 36,16f.; CG III 14,9f.; CG II 9,25.
2. Cf. e.g. the figure of Ennoia in Simonianism, Iren. adv. haer. I 23,2f. (Harvey I 191-3) which E. Haenchen argues is part of the original, mythological pre-Christian Gnosis of Simon ("Gab es eine vorchristliche Gnosis?", ZTK 49 (1952), pp.316 - 49. See also Wilson, The Gnostic Problem, pp.99f.; Gnosis, pp.48f.); Pistis Sophia in NatArch CG II 94,5 - 96,15; OnOrWld CG II 98,11 - 106,27; Sophia in SJC BG 118,1 - 121,13; GrSeth CG VII 50,25 - 51,20, etc.
3. Cf. e.g. the Ptolemean view in Iren. adv. haer. I 2,2 - 5,6 (Harvey I 13-51); Exc. ex Theod. 44,1 - 53,5 (Sagnard 154-68); 67,1 - 68 (Sagnard 190-2); Val Exp CG XI 33,28-38; 34,23-37.
4. Cf. Iren. adv. haer. I 1,2 (Harvey I 10f.); 2,1 (Harvey I 13f.); Hipp. Ref. VI 30,5f. (Wendland 157.18-24); Epiph. Pan. XXXI 5,8 (Holl 1,392.7-11). The last female name of the six androgynous (i.e. twelve) beings produced by the Saviour and Pistis Sophia in the Epistle of Eugnostos is Pistis Sophia (Eug CG III 83,1f.).
5. BG 36,16; CG III 14,9. Schmidt, Philotesia, p.329, suggests that this may indicate that we are now in the lower world, since there is no indication in the Apocryphon of an upper and a lower Sophia, as in the Ptolemean system described by Irenaeus, or as in the Ophite scheme seen by him as a model for the former.
6. Cf. GrSeth CG VII 50,27 (†Ϟοφιᾶ τῆς ωνῆς). She is also described as a προύνοια acting out of guilelessness (ἡ μὴ τὰ τὰ κατὰ ) in ll. 28f. See further below.
7. Cf. CG II 8,11 = IV 12,19. BG 33,16 has προύνοια. Cf. Giversen, Apocryphon, p.192.
8. Cf. BG 53,5 - 54,4 and parr. See Giversen, *ibid.*, who appears to identify the two Epinoias.
9. TrimProt CG XIII 39,13-32. Cf. GEgypt CG III 56,22 - 57,18 = IV 68,5-10; 69,1-3 which has Eleleth request a ruler for chaos and the underworld. This results in the appearance of a cloud called "material (ἐλκεύς) Sophia" which issues in two monads, Sakla, the great angel, and Nebruel, the great demon.

10. 39,32 - 40,19.
11. Adv.haer. I 29,4 (Harvey I 225). On "Prunicus" see below.
12. Cf. BG 30,4-7 and parr. It is therefore not necessary to see the phrase: "qui adstat Monogeni" as an interpolation, as Harvey does (p.225), on the grounds that there has been no previous mention of him. Theodoret's version may have omitted this in the interests of brevity.
13. Thus the Apocryphon speaks of the first luminary Harmoze<sup>l</sup> as the angel in the first aeon (BG 33,9f.; CG III 11,24 - 12,1) or the first angel (CG II 8,5f.; IV 12,10f.). Cf. NatArch CG II 93,8f. 18f.; 94,3 where Eleleth identifies himself as "the great angel".
14. Cf. Iren. adv.haer. I 30,3.6-13 (Harvey I 228f. 232-9); Ptolemeans of adv.haer. I 4,1 - 5,6 (Harvey I 31-51) etc.
15. BG 36,16 - 37,1; CG III 14,10.-14; CG II 9,25-9; CG IV 15, 1-4. There may be a play on ἐνθυμησις here. Sophia can conceive an ἐνθυμησις, since she is a heavenly aeon, but as an emanation of the Spirit she can only do it in and with the consent of the Spirit's own ἐνθυμησις and foreknowledge (πρόγνωσις).
16. BG 37,1-6; CG III 14,19-23. The copyist of CG III 14,14-19 has wrongly inserted a passage which rightly occurs in 15,4-9, perhaps misled by the same prepositional phrase ΝΖΗΤΕ at 14,14 and 15,3f.
17. CG II 9,29-33; CG IV 15,4f. The latter has συνε[υδοκεῖν] at 15,5 to the εὐδοκεῖν of CG II 9,30.
18. Cf. e.g. BG 32,19 - 33,3 and parr.; 34,19 - 35,5 and parr.
19. BG 47,4-7 = CG III 21,8f. Significantly the parallel in CG II 14,7 = IV 22,8f. denies that he descended to her.
20. BG 60,12-14; CG III 30,10-12 has "they sent". Again significantly the parallel in CG II 23,14-22 = IV 36,9-14 is very confused, but essentially insists that it was Sophia who descended to correct her deficiency, not her consort.
21. Cf. BG 53,18 - 54,4 and parr.

22. But cf. Janssens, art.cit., p.63, who argues that the male virginal spirit is Barbelo, the virginal spirit who becomes a First Man (cf. BG 27,19-21).
23. "Nag-Hamadi Studien III", ZRGG 14(1962), 356-61.
24. Adv.haer. I 29,4 (Harvey I 225f.).
25. BG 37,6-11; CG III 14,23 - 15,2; CG II 9,33-5. The opening circumstantial conditional clause of CG III and II is preferable to BG which opens with a principal clause and follows with the circumstantial. The references in the short recension to the Father and Sophia nodding assent (BG 37,3.7f. = CG III 14,20.24), which are not present in the long recension, may mark an echo of the earlier pattern of emanation of the aeons which required the Father's nod of assent. However, since we have moved to a new pattern of production by the union of male and female aeons, the long may have felt the concept inappropriate, since no reference is made to it in the passages recounting the production of the luminaries and of Adamas.
26. Cf. Janssens, *ibid.*, p.62.
27. Cf. CG III 23,21 (= BG 51,3) which speaks of how the Mother (Sophia) wants to recover the power she had given the archon in wantonness ( πρὸς ἡλικίαν ).
28. Apocryphon, p.195. Cf. Schottroff, Der Glaubende, p.46, who argues that the versions in CG III and CG II clearly show the problems posed by sexuality and the way it is sublimated in the Apocryphon to exonerate Sophia. Such a process has gone much further in the latter than in Iren. I 29, and the lack of explicit syzygies in the latter may derive from modesty regarding sexual ideas rather than from the fact that they were a later addition, as Schenke, art.cit., pp.359f., argues.
29. Cf. Liddell and Scott, A Greek-English Lexicon, 9th ed., Oxford 1940, vol.II, p.1537.
30. Adv.haer. I 29,4 (Harvey I 226).
31. *Ibid.*, I 30,3 (Harvey I 228f.).
32. In "Sophia-Prunikos", Eranos (Acta Philologica Suecana) 45 (1947), pp.169-72.

33. In his edition of Origen's Contra Celsum, Oxford 1953, p.350 n.1.
34. Orig. c.Cels. VI 34f. (P.Koetschau GCS 3, Leipzig 1899, 103.15, 104.23-8).
35. Cf. Pan. XXXI 5,7 (Holl 1,392.2; Truth produces her mother's wanton desire:  $\mu\eta\tau\rho\iota\kappa\eta\iota\upsilon$  ....  $\pi\rho\omicron\upsilon\nu\iota\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha\upsilon$  ); 5,8 (392.8; Man and Church reveal a duodecad of wanton or procreative (  $\pi\rho\omicron\upsilon\nu\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$  ) androgynes); 5,9 (392.13f.; Word and Life reveal a decad of wanton (  $\pi\rho\omicron\upsilon\nu\iota\kappa\omicron\varsigma$  ) androgynes) etc.
36. Pan. XXI 2,3-5 (Holl 1,240,1-12).
37. Ibid., XXV 2,2.4; 3,2 (Holl 1,269.2-4.8-12. 24-270.2). Cf. XXI, 2,5-6 (ibid., 240.12 - 241.10).
38. Cf. XXXVII 3,2 (Holl 2,54.3) etc. and especially 6,2 (ibid., 58.10-14) for the definition. Cf. ΛXV 4,1f. (Holl 1,271.6-12) for a fuller treatment.
39. BG 37,12-16; CG III 15,4-8; CG II 10,2-5. BG has: "was unable to remain ....." at 37,12, and: "hateful in its (m.) appearance" at 37,14f. The versions of the latter in CG III 15,6f.: "it had no  $\mu\omicron\rho\phi\eta$  in her  $\mu\omicron\rho\phi\eta$  ", and CG II 10,4: "and it was different (  $\omega\beta\beta\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota\tau$  ) from her form (  $\sigma\mu\omicron\tau$  )", seem preferable, in that the reason given, her action without her consort, would suggest, according to the Gnostic and particularly Valentinian conception, as Janssens notes (art.cit., p.63), that among engendered beings the female supplies the essence and the male the form. Cf. Hipp.Ref. VI 30,6-8 (Wendland 157.22 - 158.10); Exc.ex Theod. 68 (Sagnard 192); Iren. adv. haer. I 2,3 (Harvey I 16). A parallel passage to the Apocryphon in TrimProt CG XIII 39,21-6 speaks of the great Demon (Saklas, i.e. Samael Ialtabaoth) as having neither shape ( $\mu\omicron\rho\phi\eta$ ) nor perfection but having the glory shape of those begotten in darkness.
40. Adv.haer. I 29,4 (Harvey I 226). On the guilelessness (simplicitas;  $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha$  ?) of Sophia cf. AJ CG II 23,20-2 = CG IV 36,12f.; GrSeth CG VII 50,27-30; TrimProt CG XIII 40,15ff.
41. NatArch CG II 94,5-17. For a more elaborate treatment cf. OnOrWld CG II 98,1 - 100,10.
42. Hipp.Ref. VI 30,6-8 (Wendland 157.22 - 158.10).

43. Adv.haer. I 2,2 (Harvey I 14f.).
44. BG 37,16 - 38,1; CG III 15,8-12; CG II 10,6-11. All three differ slightly in detail, but the general sense is clear. Thus CG II 10,8f. describes the being as of different (ετῶν ἑσπερίων) snake (δράκων)-type (τύπος) and with the countenance (ὄψις) of a lion, and its eyes being like gleaming lightning (ζέφυρον ἡλιόεν). On the description of Sophia's offspring as lion-like cf. NatArch CG II 94,17; OnOrWld CG II 100,7. See R.A. Bullard, The Hypostasis of the Archons (Patristische Texte und Studien 10), Berlin 1970, p.105. Cf. PS Book I ch.31 (Schmidt-MacDerriot 46.14-16) on the archon with a lion-face (ὄψις), whose one half was fire, named Ialdabaoth. In Book II ch.66 (ibid., p.141.19f.) Sophia tramples on the emanation of the Authades who has a snake-face (ὄψις), and who is distinct from Ialdabaoth. The attempt by the long recension of the Apocryphon to distinguish between the form (τύπος) which is serpentine and the face (ὄψις) which is lion-like, may be due to the awkwardness of the short, which simply combines the two.
45. BG 38,1-15; CG III 15,13-23; CG II 10,11-20; CG IV 16,1-6. Cf. GEgypt CG III 56,26 - 57,16. The only real disagreements here are over the title given to the holy Spirit, which is an apparent allusion to Gen. 3:20 LXX. Thus BG 38,12f. has: "Ζωή, the mother of everyone (οὐρανίου καὶ γαίης)"; CG III 15,21: "the Mother of all living", and CG II 10,18: "the Mother of the living". The various versions may represent imperfect recollections of the Genesis verse, the Ζωή of BG possibly representing an addition. Previously the designation "holy Spirit" has applied either to the supreme being (cf. CG II 6,29; 7,16; 8,27 and parr.) or to Barbelo (cf. CG II 5,7f.). However, later on in the Apocryphon, the heavenly Revealer/Redeemer, the Epinoia, is called "Zoe" by Adam (cf. BG 53,8-10 and parr.), and later still it is apparently Sophia herself who is entitled "the mother of all living" (cf. BG 60,12-16 and parr.).
46. Adv.haer. I 29,4 (Harvey I 226).
47. I 30,5 (Harvey I 230). Cf. Orig. c.Cels. VI 31f. (Koetschau 101.5.7.12; 102.19); Epiph. Pan. XXV 2,2f. (Holl 1,269.4); 3,4f. (ibid., 270.9.11); XXVI 10,2f. (ibid., 287.6f.9); XXXVII 3,6 (Holl 2,54.13) etc.; NatArch CG II 95.8 (ἰσχυρὸς ὁ θεὸς).11f.; 96,4; OnOrWld CG II 100,14.19 (ἰσχυρὸς ὁ θεὸς).24 (ἰσχυρὸς ὁ θεός); 102,11f.; 103,1f. (ἰσχυρὸς ὁ θεός); GrSeth CG VII 53,13f.; 68,29.; TrimProt CG XIII 39,28f.



- ( ܝܕܐܬܕܒܐܘܬܐ ); SJC BG 119,16; PS Book I ch.31 (Schmidt-MacDermot 46.16) Book III ch.102 (ibid., 258.25: ܝܕܐܬܕܒܐܘܬܐ ; 259.3: ܝܕܐܬܕܒܐܘܬܐ ) etc.; Gnostic gem in C.Bonner, Studies in Magical Amulets, University of Michigan Studies: Humanistic Series vol.XLIX, Ann Arbor 1950,p.135.
48. See Wilson, Gnostic Problem, p.231 n.30; Giversen, Apocryphon pp.199ff.; Helmbold, JNES 25(1966),pp.268f., reviewing Giversen's proposed etymologies; A.Adam, "Neuere Literatur zum Problem der Gnosis", GGA 215(1963)pp.31-3.
49. Cf. Adam, art.cit.pp.31f.
50. See Giversen and Adam for the possibilities.
51. E.g. W.W. Harvey on p.230 n.1 who suggests ܕܡܢ ܕܥܠܐ ܕܡܢ ܕܡܢ Dominus Deus Patrum; or R.M. Grant (Vig.Chr. 11(1957), pp.148f), combining the solutions of Harvey and of F.C. Burkitt (Church and Gnosis, Cambridge 1932,p.38) viz. Jao Sabaoth, to produce the form Ia-el-Zebaoth (= Yahweh Elohe Zebaoth).
52. In his Histoire critique du gnosticisme, Paris 1828, Vol.II, p.198. See Giversen, Apocryphon, p.200.
53. OnOrWld CG II 100,12-14. See p.42 of Böhlig's edition.
54. 100,1-14.
55. 103,23f. Cf. NatArch CG II 87,6f.
56. Cf. NatArch CG II 94,5-17 and PS Book I ch.32 (Schmidt-MacDermot 46.9-16). In the latter case MacDermot's translation in l.14: "There existed an archon ...." should rather read: "It (Sophia's matter) became an archon ..... ( ܕܥܠܐܘܬܐ ܢܐܘܪܐܪܚܐܢ )".
57. Cf. NatArch CG II 95,7f.; TrimProt CG XIII 39,26-8. Adam, art.cit., p.32, would derive 'Ialdabaoth' from the Aramaic "begetting of paternity" (jalda + abaoth) and see it as a translation of "Saklas" which is equivalent to Ašaklun, the ܐܫܚܠܐܢ ܬܗܝܬ ܡܥܪܒܐܝܬܐ of Manicheism. The latter is a Syriac variant of Ašokar, the Mazdean or Zervanite divine being whose name

means "he who lends the power of begetting". More recently, however, G.Scholem has rejected all previous derivations of Ialdabaoth and suggested it means "begetter of Sabaoth" (in a contribution to the Puech Festschrift which I have not been able to consult). This last would certainly suit the Hypostasis of the Archons and the Untitled Treatise, where Sabaoth plays a prominent part, but would not be so appropriate in the case of the Apocryphon or Iren. adv.haer. I 30 etc. Helmbold (art. cit., p.269) adds the cautious note that because of the frequency of the ending -αωθ in magical and Gnostic texts of the time, one should seek an etymology which would cover all of them. Conversely, such texts might add a Semitic ending to their magic and Gnostic names precisely to give them an added air of authority. Thus Origen, c.Cels. VI 32(Koetschau 2,102.19), asserts that the Gnostics got the name Ialdabaoth from magic. Cf. the Semitic-sounding but probably invented names of some of the archons of Origen's Ophite diagram in VI 30: Thauthabaoth, Erathaoth, Thaphabaoth, Thartharaoth. The question of etymology thus remains open! Giversen's attempt to derive an etymology from the form ἰδλτδθωθ founders on the fact that both forms seem to be freely used, often in close conjunction. See n.47.

58. However, the same apparent contradiction is even more evident in the parallel in TrimProt CG XIII 39,23-6 which describes Ialdabaoth as first without a shape but then as having the shape of those begotten in darkness. The shapelessness may therefore simply refer to what is appropriate to the heavenly world. In relation to that world Ialdabaoth is shapeless, although he does possess a shape, that which belongs to the world of darkness.
59. Adv.haer. I 2,3 (Harvey I 16f.).
60. Cf. adv.haer. I, 2,3 (Harvey 17) and AJ BG 46,9-18 and parr.
61. On the different views of Valentinus from those of the Ptolemeans cf. Iren.adv.haer. I 11,1 (Harvey I 98-101); Ps. Tert.adv.omn.haer. 4 (A. Kroymann CSEL 47, Vienna 1906, 221.16-20). See on this Quispel, "The Original Doctrine of Valentine", Vig.Chr. 1 (1947) pp.43-73; G.C. Stead, "The Valentinian Myth of Sophia", JTS n.s. 20(1969), pp.81-90.
62. BG 38,15 - 39,1; CG III 15,23 - 16,4; CG II 10,20-4. Cf. TrimProt CG XIII 39,28-32. The addition in CG III 16,2f. "from a region ( τοῦ πους ) to a region ( τοῦ τῶς )" is superfluous and contradicts the continuation which has him take possession of regions. CG II 10,21 has "his Mother" and in 1.24 omitted an object for "he took possession".



63. Adv.haer. I 29,4(Harvey I 226).
64. BG 39,1-4; CG III 16,4-6; Cf. NatArch CG II 94,35 - 95,1.
65. Ibid. The "firmament of heaven" of Irenaeus could well be described as a flaming fiery aeon, since it is probably meant to represent the heavenly fiery realm beyond the circle of fixed stars, the empyrean. Cf. Till,p.119. Giversen (Apocryphon, p.202) thinks that the firmament idea of Irenaeus may be referred to by CG II 10,25 "which he now is", but this appears to refer to the flame.
66. CG II 10,24-6.
67. BG 39,4-18; CG III 16,7-15. CG III 16,13 has omitted the mention of the 360 angelic beings through homœoteleuton (  $\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\mu\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\ \delta\gamma\gamma\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$  ).
68. CG II 10,26 - 11,4.
69. Cf. CG II 11,22-5.
70. Cf. CG II 12,35 - 13,5 = CG IV 20,10-18.
71. Adv.haer. I 29,4 (Harvey I 226). CG II 10,26f., which speaks of Ialdabaoth being in  $\alpha\ \pi\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$  , may, however, be closer to Irenaeus. As Giversen notes (Apocryphon, p.203),  $\epsilon\zeta\omicron\nu\sigma\iota\varsigma$  can be used as a synonym for  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\nu\gamma\mu\iota\varsigma$  to designate Ialdabaoth's powers, cf. CG II 15,7f. and 14.
72. Thus if we add the twelve powers to the twelve angels we get 360 instead of the 348 of Till's calculation on p.43 of his edition. Cf. Giversen, Apocryphon, pp.216f.
73. BG 39,18 - 40,4; CG III 16,15-19. CG III couples the ignorance with the darkness and adds that the powers, too, were in ignorance of him who begot them. This may represent an attempt to correct an original misinterpretation of the ignorance. On  $\alpha\ \rho\chi\iota\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\omega\rho$  as a title for Ialdabaoth cf. CG II 12,29; IV 20,5; SJC BG 119,14; 125,16; OnOrWld CG II 102,11; 103,4; 104,12; 106,13.19; TrimProt CG XIII 40,23 etc. Janssens' (Muséon 84(1971), p.403) note that the term occurs in the same place in all four versions is inaccurate. However, it is surely significant that it occurs in the long recension in the context of double names for the seven (planets) rather than double names for the twelve (signs of the Zodiac) which wax and wane, as in the short. The latter may well be the original context.

74. Cf. CG II 11,10-22 = IV 17,16 - 18,6.
75. BG 40,5-19; CG III 16,20 - 17,5; CG II 10,28 - 11,4; CG IV 17,1-5. For a detailed comparison (omitting CG IV, of course) see Giversen, Apocryphon, pp.205-8.
76. GEgypt CG III 58,7-22; IV 70,1-5.
77. III 57,16 - 58,5; IV 69,1-5.
78. Pace Böhlig-Wisse, The Gospel of the Egyptians, p.184.
79. CG III 17,22 has  $\lambda\omega\theta$  and the parallel to BG 43,13 is missing.
80. A J CG IV 19,17 (= II 12,16) has  $\lambda[\theta]\omega[\theta]$ . GEgypt CG III 58,8 has  $\lambda\theta[\omega\theta]$ .
81. GEgypt CG III 58,12 has a lacuna but only the shorter form "Galila" would fit. Cf. Böhlig-Wisse, op.cit., p.124.
82. BG 40,1 -13 reads: "Kainan and Kae ( $\kappa\alpha\eta$ ) who is usually called 'Kain', viz. 'the sun';" while CG III 16,75 - 17,1 has: "Kainan Kasin ( $\kappa\alpha\kappa\iota\eta$ ) who is usually called 'the sun'."
83. In GEgypt CG III 58,15.18 = IV 70,1.4 the names "Kain" and "Abel" are in lacunae but their restoration by Böhlig and Wisse, op.cit., pp.124f., clearly fits the gaps in the texts.
84. The latter is the proposed reading of Böhlig and Wisse, ibid.
85. BG 40,19 - 41,6; CG III 17,5-12. This seems to be the sense of a confused passage.
86. BG 41,6-12; CG III 17,12-17. The version in CG III 17,15 which has "through the glories" is perhaps preferable to BG 41,9 "through the times", since the sense is that these beings wane through the influence of, and the names given by, the heavenly ones, and wax through the influence of, and names given by, Saklas.
87. On p.43 of his edition. Cf. Giversen, Apocryphon, p.205.
88. Ibid., pp.203-5, criticising the argument of W.Foerster in "Das Apokryphon des Johannes", Gott und die Götter, p.136, that the powers had three names, one from heaven, the second from the evil powers, the third those given them by men, i.e. the usual names for the signs of the Zodiac.

89. Cf. Giversen, Apocryphon, p.217. In Eug CG III 83,10 - 84,8 we have a similar scheme whereby the twelve powers produced by the Saviour and his consort Pistis Sophia produce 360 powers so that the twelve powers are archetypes of the twelve months of the year, and the 360 powers of the 360 (sic!) days of the year.
90. "The Identity of the Archons in the 'Apocryphon Johannis'", Viq.Chr. 32(1978),pp.241-54,esp.248ff.
91. *Ibid.*, pp.248ff.
92. Apocryphon, p.211. Giversen's derivation from מלכא is thus preferable to Helmbold's suggestion(JNES 66(1965), pp.269f.) of the Phenician milkart, the God of the underworld.
93. *Art.cit.*, pp.249ff. Against Giversen, *op.cit.*, pp.206f., who allows the possibility that the two could have been originally united and later split equal weight with the reverse, it is surely more likely that the two would have been combined rather than separated. BG's alternation of Adonaios and Sabaoth in 42,3 and 43,20 is not relevant to the argument (pace Giversen, p.207) since it occurs in an entirely different list, that of the planets.
94. *Ibid.* The very close similarity of the parallel passage in the Gospel of the Egyptians may suggest that it was influenced here by the long recension of the Apocryphon.
95. *Ibid.*, pp.251ff. Cf.Giversen, *op.cit.*, p.212, for a suggested division in terms of the seven zodiacal signs on or above the celestial equator where it divides the ecliptic, and the five signs below.
96. CG II 11,3f. Cf. GEgypt CG III 58,21f., which has all twelve set over the underworld [and chaos?]. Is the latter again dependent on the long recension of the Apocryphon?
97. CG II 11,4-10; CG IV 17,16f.
98. CG II 11,10-22; IV 17,18 - 18,6.
99. CG II 11,22-5.
100. *Ibid.*, pp.216-8. Thus CG II 19,3 has 365 angels create man and BG 50,18ff.,360.

101. CG II 11,26 - 12,26; IV 18,18 - 20,1. Cf. BG 41,16 - 44,9 = CG III 17,20 - 20,25.
102. CG II 12,26-33; IV 20,2-10. Cf. BG 41,1-12 = CG III 17,7-17.
103. CG II 12,33 - 13,5; IV 20,10-18. Cf. BG 44,7-9. See also TrimProt CG XIII 40,5-8. There is no trace in BG of the last statement; that Ialdabaoth did not see the heavenly archetypes but that it was his mother's power which was responsible. However, this is very similar to the Valentinian idea; the Demiurge created after the image of the heavenly world, in ignorance, since it was his mother who worked through him. Cf. Iren. adv.haer. I 5,1f. (Harvey I 41-6); Hipp.Ref. VI 33 (Wendland 162.1-9).
104. BG 41,12-15; CG III 17,17-20. On the form, "chaos and the underworld (ἄμνρη)" cf. GEgypt CG III 56,25; 58,22; TrimProt CG XIII 40,24.
105. See Till's note to BG 41,13. CG II 11,4-10 which comes immediately after the enumeration of the twelve, has the seven set over the seventh heaven (i.e. they are distinct from the planetary rulers each ruling one of the lower heavens up to the seventh), and seven and five given a share of his fire, a process repeated with the seven planetary rulers later (cf. CG II 12,4ff. and par.). Finally CG II 11,3 has the gloss on Belias, the last of the twelve (and of the five); he is over the abyss of the underworld.
106. Thus BG 41,18 has Iaoth (Ἰάωθ) as in 40,5 and 42,3, Adonaios fifth as in 40,9. But CG III, although it has Adonaios fifth in 16,24 and 18,3, has Haoth (Ἠάωθ) in 16,20 and Aoth (Ἀάωθ) in 17,22. CG II, too, although it has Athoth (Ἀθάωθ) in 10,29 and 11,26, has Adonaiou fifth in 10,33 but Sabaoth in 11,31.
107. Cf. BG 41,16f. = CG III 17,20f. and BG 42,7-10 = CG III 18,7-9. Cf. CG II 11,34f. = CG IV 18,24f.
108. Cf. BG 48,6 - 50,6 and parr.
109. BG 42,13 - 43,2; CG III 18,12-19. Cf. BG 50,15 - 52,8 and parr. on the impotence of the archons to raise Adam, until Ialdabaoth breathes into him the power in him of his mother, which causes the archons to be envious.
110. BG 44,5-9. Cf. CG II 12,25f. and 34 - 13,1 and par.

111. Cf. CG II 15,29 - 19,10 = IV 24,21 - 29,19. This passage refers at the end to other names contained in a certain "Book of Zoroaster", which may also be the source of the names given.
112. GEgypt CG III 57,16 - 58,22 and par. See Böhlig-Wisse, The Gospel of the Egyptians, pp.120-4, for their suggested reconstructions. Doresse, in his edition, "Le livre sacré du grand Esprit invisible" ou "L'Évangile des Égyptiens", Journal Asiatique 254(1966)pp.384f., suggests there may be a reference in ll.1-5 to the division of the twelve into seven and five, the latter being commanded to rule over chaos. However, this may be weakened by the fact that all twelve are apparently to rule over chaos and the underworld, and not seven over the heavens and five over chaos, as in AJ BG 41,12-15 and parr.
113. Cf. Theodore bar Konai, Liber Scholiorum XI (CSCO 69 ed. A.Scher, Louvain 1960, 317.9ff. : H.Pognon, Inscriptions mandaites des coupes de Khouabir, Paris 1898,p.130; A.Adam, Texte zum Manichäismus (Kleine Texte 175) Berlin 1969,pp.21.163 - 22.169); Great Greek Abjuration formula (Migne Supplementum Graecum I 1464B = Adam,ibid., p.98.48f. = Nebrod/Νεβρωδ). Priscillian in his first Tractate speaks of Sacias and Nebroel as demons (CSEL 18, ed. G.Schepss, Prague/Vienna/Leipzig 1889, 17.29; 21.6). See Böhlig-Wisse, op.cit., p.183.
114. Cf. GEgypt CG III 58,7-11 = IV 70,1-5 and AJ CG II 10,28 - 11,4 = IV 17,1-5. GEgypt CG III 58,12 only has room in the lacuna for ΓΑΛΙΑΔΑ not the ΚΔΛΙΑΔΟΙΜΒΡΙ of AJ CG II 10,32. GEgypt CG III 58,13 has ΙΩΘΗΛ for the ΙΔΘΗΛ of AJ CG II 10,32. GEgypt CG III 58,12f. has [Α]ΔΩΝΑΙΟC for the ΔΔΩΝΑΙΟΥ of AJ CG II 10,33. GEgypt CG III 58,18 has ΔΚΙΡΕCΙΝΑ for the ΔΒΡΙCΕΝΕ of AJ CG II 10,37 = IV 17,3. GEgypt CG IV 70,4 has ΙΟΥΘΗΛ for the ΙΩΘΗΛ of AJ CG II 10,37. GEgypt CG III 58,19 has ΖΑΡΗ[ΟΥΠΙΔΗΛ] for the ΔΡΜΟΥΠΙΕΗΛ of AJ CG II 11,1 and GEgypt CG III 58,20 has ΔΡΧ[ΕΙΡ ΔΔΩΝΕΙΝ ?] for the ΜΕΛΧΕΙΡΔΔΩΝΕΙΝ of AJ CG II 11,2. The latter might be reconstructed ΔΡΧ[ΩΝ ΔΔΩΝΕΙΝ] which would be closer to the βασιλῆς τε καὶ ἁδωνίς alluded to by Giversen, Apocryphon, p.211.
115. Cf. BG 41,12-15; CG III 17,17-20; CG II 11,4-7.
116. Cf. GEgypt CG III 56,22-5 = IV 68,5-9; III 57,5-11.



117. BG 72,2-4; CG III 37,6f.; CG II 28,11-15; CG IV 43,24-9.  
Cf. Giversen, Apocryphon, p.205.
118. CH I 9.
119. Cf. e.g. Iren. adv.haer. I 5,1 (Harvey I 43), which speaks of the Demiurge preserving the image of the Only-begotten Son and the angels and archangels created by him preserving the image of the rest of the aeons. This would, of course, include the Duodecad.
120. See n.103.
121. CG II 12,10-15 = IV 17,17-23.
122. Apocryphon, p.212.
123. CG II 12,7-10; IV 17,16.
124. 12,15-22; IV 17,24 - 18,6.
125. 12,15-18; IV 17,24 - 18,2. Cf TrimProt CG XIII 39,26-8. The reading of CG II 12,16 'ΙΑΛΤΑΒΑΘ[ΩΘ] is confirmed by IV 17,26 which appears to supply the missing letters. Saklas is found in the short recension, cf. BG 41,6; 42,10 and parr. (CG III 18,10 has ΣΑΚΛΑ), but not Samael. "Saklas" is used without explanation by the Apocryphon, as an alternative name for "Ialdabaoth", the name actually given the first archon by Sophia, his mother (cf. BG 38,13f. and parr.). In NatArch CG II 95,7f. in reply to the first archon's boast that he was God of the All Zoe cried out: "You are wrong, Sakla (ΣΑΚΛΑ)", the interpretation of which, the text continues, is "Ialtabaoth". TrimProt CG XIII 39,26-8 seems to be suggesting the same kind of thing when it gives the name of the great Demon who rules over the lowest part of the underworld and chaos as "Sakla", that is Samael, Ialtabaoth. Sakla is also the name of the god of the (spiritually) dead in ApocAd CG V 74,3.7, who is called the archon, or god of the powers (77,3ff.). We have already noted his occurrence as the great angel in GEgypt and his role in Manicheism and in the 1st Tractate of Priscillian (where he appears along with Nebruel and Samael as a demon). The usual derivation from the Aramaic סַכְלָא, "fool", would fit the contexts well in the Apocryphon, the Trimorphic Protennoia, the Apocalypse of Adam, the Hypostasis and the Gospel of the Egyptians. Thus in AJ BG 41,6ff., Saklas names





127. Cf. CG II 11,7-10 and CG II 12,4ff.; BG 42,13-18; CG II 11,19-22 and CG II 12,8-10; BG 42,18 - 43,6.
128. Apocryphon, p.215.
129. The treatment of the origin, nature and three names of the Demiurge in TrimProt CG XIII 39,20-32 may be dependent, to some extent, on the long recension of the Apocryphon.
130. BG 41,16 - 42,7; CG III 17,20 - 18,7; CG II 11,26-34; CG IV 18,18-24.
131. BG 42,7-9; CG III 18,7f.; CG II 11,34f.; CG IV 18,24f. The latter three all have  $\epsilon\beta\delta\epsilon\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ , while BG 42,8 has the Coptic ordinal  $\mathcal{M}\epsilon\mathcal{Z}\mathcal{C}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{W}\mathcal{Q}\mathcal{E}$ .
132. BG 42,9f.; CG III 18,8f. This may be a marginal note incorporated into the text of the short recension, as Giversen suggests (op.cit., p.223), or alternatively it may have been omitted by the redactors of the long because they thought the seven were the seven powers immediately preceding (cf. CG II 11,23 and par.), who had been created by the (? 7) archons. These seven powers therefore could not be said to control the cosmos.
133. BG 41,18 - 42,6 = CG III 17,21 - 18,6; 43,13 - 44,4; CG II 11,26-33; 12,16-25 = CG IV 19,16-26.
134. Giversen, Apocryphon, p.219, points to the way  $\mathcal{Z}\mathcal{C}$  is used as an equivalent of  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\sigma\omega\pi\omicron\nu$  in CG II 12,1f., and argues that these terms refer not simply to the face, but to the whole form of appearance, as in astrological prosopa speculation. Certainly Celsus describes the seven archontic demons of the Ophite diagram in terms both of  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\sigma\omega\pi\omicron\nu$  and  $\mu\omicron\rho\phi\acute{\eta}$ , cf. Orig. c.Cels. VI 30 (Koetschau 101.4-22); 33 (ibid., 102.27 - 103.1). PS Book III ch.126 (Schmidt-MacDermot 317.22 - 319.10) lists the archons of the twelve chambers with their respective animal faces ( $\mathcal{Z}\mathcal{O}$ ), and Theodore bar Konai, Lib.Schol. XI (Pognon 145f., 213f.) describes the Ophite system of ten heavens in each of which is an angel with an animal form. Cf. also NatArch CG II 87,27-9 (the archons have animal faces ( $\mathcal{Z}\mathcal{O}$ )); "Gnostics" of Epiph Pan.XXVI 10,6 (Holl 1,287.15 - 288.1 : Sabaoth, the archon of the seventh heaven, has the form ( $\mu\omicron\rho\phi\acute{\eta}$ ) of an ass or a pig).

See further Chadwick's edition of the Contra Celsum, pp.345 n.6, 349 n.4, and Bullard, Hypostasis, pp.61f. The latter points out that although Giversen's contention is supported by the texts, it is animal heads rather than bodies which appear on magical gems and in the papyri.

135. Cf. Orig. c.Cels. VI 30 (Koetschau 100.4-8). There the name of the first archon is Michael. However, in VI 31 (ibid., 101.5-11) the name of the first archon, who is described as "lion-like ( λεοντοειδής )", is Ialdabaoth. Earlier in the Apocryphon Ialdabaoth was described as in the form of a (snake and a) lion. Cf. BG 37,20f. and parr. See n.44.
136. On the snake with seven heads cf. PS Book II ch.66 (Schmidt-MacDermot 137.18f.) and Book III ch.126 (ibid., 318.25-7). The latter describes the archons in the tenth chamber as having seven snake ( δράκων ) heads. The version in CG III 18,2 is virtually a mirror image of its description of Ialdabaoth in 15,11, which might suggest that it has misunderstood the reference to the seven-headed snake, or thought that Iazo represented Ialdabaoth, but cf. PS Book II ch.66 (ibid., p.141.22) where Pistis Sophia tramples on both the snake with seven heads and the power with a lion - and snake - face.
137. The confusion of Adonaios and Sabaoth is easily understandable, and has already taken place in CG II 10,33 and GEgypt CG III 58,13-15.
138. CG IV 18,19 preserves the final -N of δράκων .
139. Cf. BG 40,17 = CG III 17,4 ( ΔΑΜΟΝΙΝ ).
140. Adv.haer. I 30,5 (Harvey I 230). On the holy hebdomad cf. 30,4 (Harvey ibid.); on the identification of these with the planets cf. 30,9 (Harvey I 236); on their association with the days of the week cf. 30,10 (Harvey I 237).
141. Orig. c.Cels. VI 31 (Koetschau 101.5 - 102.4).
142. Cf. OnOrWld CG II 101.9-23.
143. 101,23 - 102,2.
144. Cf. BG 43,11 - 44,4 and parr.

145. "An Amulet of the Ophite Gnostics", in Commemorative Studies in Honor of Theodore Leslie Shear, Hesperia, Suppl.8, Athens 1949, pp.43-6; Studies in Magical Amulets, University of Michigan Studies: Humanistic Series vol. XLIX, Ann Arbor 1950, pp.135-8.
146. Art.cit., p.244.
147. C.Cels. VI 30 (Koetschau 100.4-22).
148. Ibid. VI 31 (Koetschau 100.31 - 102.4).
149. Art.cit., p.245, referring to Tac.Hist. V 4.
150. Hypostasis, p.105 n.366. See Bousset, Hauptprobleme, pp.351-5.
151. Ibid. The Adonaios of BG 42,3 and CG III 18,3 is best seen as an easily understandable change from the original Sabaoth.
152. VI 32 (Koetschau 102.25; Ἀδωναιός ).
153. Cf. PS Book II ch.66 (Schmidt-MacDermot 142.2-4) where the archon with the basilisk face (2A) and seven heads, although not apparently equated with the Sun, is yet said to be stronger than all the rest in its evil.
154. Art.cit., p.250.
155. Giversen, Apocryphon, p.221, does, however, suggest that ραμ means "ram" in a few instances, and that a copyist, coming across the term and aware of its double meaning ram/lion, interpreted it in the former sense but used the term ἐσθλόν, "sheep", to avoid ambiguity.
156. Cf. Orig.c.Cels. VI 31 (Koetschau 101.10f.); Iren.adv.haer. I 30,4f. (Harvey I 230f.); 30,9 (Harvey I 236). Ialdabaoth is also in the sixth or seventh heaven in the "Gnostic" scheme, cf. Epiph. Pan. XXVI 10,1-3 (Holl 1,287.1-9). In Plutarch, de Iside et Osiride, 47, Areimanios created six gods hostile to Ahura Mazda and his allies.
157. C.Cels. VI 32 (Koetschau 102.19-26). On the combination in magical texts cf. Papyri Graecae Magicae, ed. K. Preisendanz, vol I, Leipzig 1928, P XII ll.285-8 (invocation of the greatest God Ἰώω, Ἐσθλόν, Ἀδωναιός ..... Ἐλωειν ..... Ἀστράφαιον ). P XXXVI 1.42 ( Ἰώω, Ἐσθλόν, Ἀδωναιός, Ἐλωειν, Ἀστράφαιον ).

ⲡⲁⲃⲱⲛⲱⲓ, ⲉⲗⲱⲓ .....); Ausgewählte koptische Zaubertexte, ed. A.Kropp, 3 vols, Brussels 1930-1, XV 1.55 (vol I xi, 47; II 58: Iao, Sabaoth, Adonai, Eloiu ....)etc.

158. CH I 9.

159. Adv.haer. I 5,2 (Harvey I 44f.). Theodoret's version has the reading "not intelligible", but Tertullian, whose account is evidently dependent on Irenaeus, has no trace of the negative and gives the adjective as "νοερός" (adv.Val. 20: Kroymann CSEL 47 199.1). Cf. the views of the Marcosians on the seven circular bodies or heavens in Iren. adv.haer. I 17,1 (Harvey I 165). However, the Sun and the Moon are above them.
160. Ibid. In Epiphanius' account of the Ophites, Pan. XXXVII 3,6 (Holl 2,54.13 - 55.1), unlike that of Irenaeus, Ialdabaoth created seven sons who themselves created the seven heavens. On the relation between the two accounts and that of Pseudo-Tertullian, see Schottroff, Der Glaubende, pp.82-6.
161. BG 42,10-13; CG III 18,9-12; CG II 11,35 - 12,4; CG IV 18,26 - 19,2. The versions all differ slightly, but this appears to be the sense. The long recension omits Saklas, probably because it has already explained it as one of the names of Ialdabaoth. It speaks of Ialdabaoth indwelling the various forms (CG II 12,1 = IV 18,28) and adds a final gloss "while he is in the midst of the Seraphim" (CG II 12,3f. = IV 19,2). The long recension may represent by these details a less original form. The Seraphim are probably the seven powers just mentioned. Is this an allusion to Is. 6:2? Cf. also Ezek. 1: 5-14 LXX and Rev. 4:6-8.
162. BG 42,13-18; CG III 18,12-16; CG II 12,4f.; CG IV 19,3f. BG 42,15 adds to the gift of fire a share of Ialdabaoth's own power, and the long recension omits the reference to his withholding the light-power he got from his mother, since it has already mentioned it (CG II 11,8-10). On this motif of the Demiurge keeping his seven sons in ignorance cf. Epiph. Pan. XXXVII 3,6 (Holl 2,55.1-4).
163. BG 42,18 - 43,2; CG III 18,16-19; CG II 12,5-8; CG IV 19,4-6. The variations may derive from different interpretations of the original Greek.

164. BG 43,2-6; CG III 18,19-22; CG II 12,8-10; CG IV 19,7-9. BG 43,3 has the form: "he let himself be called", thus alluding to the initiative of his followers, while CG III 18,20 adds: "over them", which again involves his followers, whereas CG II 12,8f. stresses that he named himself. The long recension has preferred the notion of the place from which one comes, as in its doublet at CG II 11,21f., to the idea of one's substance. But the latter term ( ὁ πρόστασις ) occurs in the similar passage in GEgypt CG III 59,1, although there the verb appears to be positive, not negative as in the AJ. See Böhlig-Wisse, *The Gospel of the Egyptians*, pp.126 and 184. The recurrence of the Greek loan word πείθειν in all these texts at this point argues against the version in the long recension, since it is hard to see how one can disobey or distrust a place. Cf. NatArch CG II 86,27-32; 94,19-23; OnOrWld CG II 103,8-15 which describe Ialdabaoth's boast as sinning against the All, or GrSeth CG VII 53,27-33 and 64,17-33 which speak of the empty boast of the archon and his disagreement with the supreme Father. The allusion to his calling himself "God" is proleptic, since the actual boast does not occur till BG 44,14f. and parr.
165. Cf. Iren. *adv.haer.* I 5,4 (Harvey I 46f.); Hipp.*Ref.* VI 33 (Wendland 162.5-9). According to Irenaeus' account the Demiurge is psychic, owing his origin to Sophia's repentance, while the rest of the psychic substance ( ὁ πρόστασις ) derives from her fear. As psychic he is too weak to know anything spiritual, and in this sense he disobeys his substance by claiming to be God, i.e. to be the supreme spiritual being.
166. BG 43,6-8; CG III 18,22-4; CG II 12,10-13; CG IV 19,10-13. The long recension describes the authorities as with Ialdabaoth (CG II 12,11f.; IV 19,10f.), and adds that it was through his thought ( ἡ ἐκείνη ) as well as his speaking that they (CG II has "he") came into existence (CG II 12,12f.; IV 19,12f.). The latter may reflect the tendency of the long to create a greater degree of internal harmony and consistency: as the supreme being brought his offspring into being by mental conception ( ἐκ νοῦ ; ἡ ἐκείνη ), so too with the Demiurge, Ialdabaoth. Cf. Sakla's creative word calling forth twelve aeons and seven beings in GEgypt CG III 57,21 - 58,2. Janssens, *art.cit.*, p.404, suggests that this reference to the Demiurge speaking is an evident allusion to the opening chapter of Genesis.



167. BG 43,9-11; CG III 18,24f.; CG II 12,13-15; CG IV 19,13-15. CG II 12,14 = IV 19,14 has "every power", and BG 43,9f. reads: "he named them and established powers (ἐξουσίαι)". Cf. CG III 18,25 which breaks off at "established", the following two pages being lost. The short recension's version may rest on a misinterpretation of the original Greek (ἐκείνην ἐξουσίαν ?).
168. The parallel to CG II 12,15-25 in CG IV 19,15-26 is very fragmentary but appears to be identical, as is the better preserved parallel in CG IV 24,3-14 to CG II 15,14-23.
169. On p.139 of his edition. See his note ad loc. on the preceding page.
170. Cf. Giversen, Apocryphon, p.181. On the translations of מִן־טַרְמִינֵי־חַיִּי see the remarks of Wilson in his articles in NTS 9 (1963), pp.297f.; Les textes de Nag Hammadi (NHS VII), Leiden 1975, pp.36f.
171. Zatspram 30,5-11 in R.C. Zaehner, Zurvan: A Zoroastrian Dilemma, Oxford 1955, p.162 n.1. Cf. Puech, "Fragments retrouvés de l'Apocalypse d'Allogène" in Mélanges Franz Cumont vol 2, Brussels 1936, p.938 n.2, referring to the Chronicle of Michael the Syrian on Bardaisan which has each planet as creator of the marrow, bones, sinews, blood, flesh, skin, hair respectively, and to the Manichean Kephalaia ch. XLII (I,1 p.107, 11.29-32) which has the order marrow, bones, sinews, flesh, veins, blood, skin.
172. OnOrWld CG II 101,24 - 102,2.
173. Lib.Schol. XI (Pognon 133,195f.); Puech, *ibid.*, pp.936ff., 942 n.2 and 952 n.4; See also Hennecke-Schneemelcher, I, pp.318f.
174. *Ibid.*, Puech, *art.cit.*, p.938 n.1, notes that "powers" corresponds to the Greek ἐξουσίαι and designates the seven planetary archons. In n.2 he accepts the emendation of sa'ra, "skin", for the besra, "flesh", of the MSS, and in n.3 the emendation of binta, "understanding", i.e. εὐνοία as in BG in place of the incomprehensible bi'ta, "egg", of the text. However, we should note that no such piece of direct speech is found in our Apocryphon, although Audi may simply have been quoting. Furthermore, the powers in the Apocryphon create psychic substances, not the material body of Adam. What is significant is that, although the order does not follow any pattern, if we take Wisdom as equivalent to σοφία, understanding as εὐνοία, Elohim as Divinity, Adonai as Lordship, Zeal as Fire (ἔως) and Thought as Pronoia, we have the exact equivalent of the list in the short recension - accepting that the מִן־טַרְמִינֵי־חַיִּי of BG 43,16 and 49,13 is a mistake for מִן־טַרְמִינֵי־חַיִּי.

175. Cf. OnOrWld CG II 114,34f. in which the great (i.e. first or chief?) archon created the brain and the marrow.
176. However,  $\kappa\omega\zeta$  occurs among the otherwise exclusively feminine Greek and Coptic female names in OnOrWld CG II 101,26 - 102,2 which designate the seven powers of the seven heavens. Could the terms  $\kappa\omega\zeta$  and  $\kappa\omega\zeta\tau$  and even  $\kappa\alpha\theta\mu\alpha$  be independent attempts to render a Greek substantive like  $\xi\eta\lambda\omicron\tau\eta\varsigma$ , or alternatively  $\kappa\alpha\theta\omicron\varsigma$ , as Giversen, Apocryphon, p.227, suggests?
177. Cf. the arguments of Giversen, Apocryphon, pp.227f. and Welburn, art.cit., 247f.
178. See n.175.
179. Giversen, Apocryphon, pp.227f., evidently understands  $\sigma\omicron\phi\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  to be rendered by  $\mathfrak{M}\bar{\mathfrak{N}}\tau\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{M}\bar{\mathfrak{N}}\mathfrak{C}\mathfrak{H}\tau$  in CG II, although earlier (on p.181) he argued for  $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$  as the Greek word translated by it. If one removes "Goodness" then the long and short agree together over the first three powers (Pronoia, Divinity, Lordship) reverse the next two (Fire/Zeal, Kingdom) and agree over the next ( $\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$  /  $\mathfrak{M}\bar{\mathfrak{N}}\tau\mathfrak{P}\mathfrak{M}\bar{\mathfrak{N}}\mathfrak{C}\mathfrak{H}\tau$ ).
180. BG 44,5-9; CG II 12,25 - 13,5; CG IV 19,27 - 20,18.
181. BG 44,5-9.
182. CG II 12,25ff.; IV 19,27ff.
183. CG II 12,33 - 13,1; IV 20,10-14.
184. CG II 13,1-5; IV 20,15-18. See above p.157, n.103 and p.161. Cf. Iren. adv.haer. I 5,1 (Harvey I 43).
185. Adv.haer. I 29,4 (Harvey I 226).
186. Cf. BG 39,6-18; CG III 16,9-15 for the mention of the angels.
187. Cf. BG 44,5f. and parr.
188. Adv.haer. I 29,4 (Harvey I 226) Cf. the similar list of evils produced by the snake-like son of Ialdabaoth in adv.haer. I 30,5 (Harvey I 232: oblivio, malitia, zelus, invidia, mors).



189. Philotesia, p.333. Foerster, Gott und die Götter, p.136, also accepts that Irenaeus has supplied the names of the five kings of the underworld, and suggests that the archetype for this may be the pentad of aeons beneath the supreme God (BG 29,14-16).
  
190. The same tendency in GEgypt CG III 57,20 - 58,22 and par. may explain why we hear little or nothing about the seven planetary rulers and five underworldly beings. A reference to them may be concealed in 58,1f., however, as Doresse has suggested. The compression of the whole passage concerning Sakla's creation and his subsequent boast, as compared to the Apocryphon's account, may well derive from this same tendency and suggest the secondary nature of GEgypt at this point and its reliance on the Apocryphon, and in particular on its long recension.
  
191. Thus "Saklas" appears as a nickname for Ialdabaoth in the first group of works cited (apart from Irenaeus' Barbelognostic account), suggesting his foolish and Satanic character, while "Samael", another such name, is ascribed to Ialdabaoth's satanic son rather than himself in the Ophite system described by Irenaeus.
  
192. Adv.haer. I 29,4 (Harvey I 226: Ego sum Deus zelator, et praeter me nemo est). On Sophia's withdrawal to form the Ogdoad cf. the Ophite view of adv.haer. I 30,3f. (Harvey I 229f.) and the Valentinian view in adv.haer. I 5,2-4 (Harvey I 44-8). The former has the Mother, Sophia, possess the eighth place, the latter calls her "Ogdoad" and has her dwell in the supercelestial region. Both groups treat her son as ignorant of her. If she is the Ogdoad in the Barbelognostic system, this implies that, as with the Ophite and Valentinian systems, there are seven heavens and rulers below her.
  
193. BG 44,9-15; CG II 13,5-9; CG IV 20,18-24. The same combination of Exod. 20:5 and Is.46:9 or 45:5 is found in GEgypt CG III 58,24-6: "I, I am a [jealous] God, and apart from me nothing has [come into being]". Cf. also GrSeth CG VII 64, 19-23, which has the archon proclaim: "I am God ... and there is no other apart from me. I am a jealous God ...."(cf. Is. 45:5; 44:6; Exod. 20:5). For a conspectus of all the Nag Hammadi texts with a similar quotation from Isaiah put into the mouth of the Demiurge see Kasser, NHS, vol.VI, p.60. The form in the long recension at this point may be influenced by the earlier boast of Ialdabaoth echoing Is.46:9 in CG II 11,20f. and par. The parallel in GEgypt CG III 58,24-6, while repeating

ἀνοκ as does the long recension of the Apocryphon, is closer to the version in BG as regards the latter half in that it has no reference to another god. On the theme of the hubris of the Demiurge cf. Schottroff, Der Glaubende, p.50 n.1.

194. BG 44,15-19; CG II 13,9-13; CG IV 20,24-9. On this see my article; "The Jealousy of God: Exod.20:5 in Gnostic and Rabbinic Theology", Studia Biblica 1978, 1: Papers on Old Testament and Related Themes, (Journal for the Study of the Old Testament Supplement Series 11), Sheffield 1979, pp.197-203.
195. BG 44,19 - 45,19 and parr. BG alone preserves the Greek which makes the allusion to Genesis more explicit.
196. BG 44,19 - 45,5; 45,11-19; 46,9-13 and parr.
197. BG 46,13-19 and parr.
198. Cf. BG 46,20 - 47,14; CG III,21,6-16; CG II 14,5-13; CG IV 22,6-15.
199. Philotesia, p.333.
200. ZRGG 14(1962), pp.59f.
201. Der Glaubende, p.50.
202. Ibid., pp.49f.
203. Cf. BG 44,9 - 45,19 and parr. and BG 45,19 - 46,15 and parr. The latter passage, with its mention of Ialdabaoth the αὐτοδύτης taking power from his mother, is also a repetition of BG 38,15ff.
204. Ibid. Cf. BG 45,6-19 and parr.
205. BG 44,19 - 45,2; CG II 13,13f.; CG IV 20,29f.
206. BG 45,2-5.
207. CG II 13,14-17; IV 20,30 - 21,3.
208. Gnosis, p.108. Cf. BG 45,6 and CG II 13,18; BG 58,2; CG III 28,18; CG II 22,10; BG 51,15; CG III 29,3; BG 64,14; CG III 32,23; CG II 25,17; CG IV 39,17; BG 66,13; CG III 33,24; CG II 26,7f.; CG IV 40,21; BG 67,19; CG III 34,19;

- CG II 26,23; CG IV 41,10; BG 68,13f.; CG III 35,2f.;  
CG II 26,32f.; CG IV 41,21; BG 69,14; CG III 35,19; CG II  
27,12; BG 70,9; CG III 36,5; CG II 27,22; BG 71,3;  
CG III 36,16; CG II 27,31f.; CG IV 43,6f.
209. Cf. SJC BG 83,1; CG III 94,1; BG 86,7; CG III 95,19;  
BG 87,9; CG III 96,15; BG 90,2; CG III 98,10; BG 100,4;  
CG III 105,4; BG 102,8; 106,11; CG III 108,17; BG 112,15ff.;  
CG III 111,19ff. (cf. Eug CG III 87,16ff.); BG 117,13; CG III  
114,9f.
210. Cf. POxy 1081,25f. which underlies SJC CG III 98,10 and reads  
κ̅ε̅, i.e. κ̅υ̅ρι̅ε̅. See Till's edition of BG, p.220. Cf.  
also the use of "Lord" in an evidently Christian-Gnostic work  
like Thomas the Contender (ThCont) CG II 139,22; 140,6;  
141,3; 142,3.9.19. As Wilson notes, *ibid.*, the variant is  
due to the confusion of two Coptic letters in the contracted  
form, and the change is an easy one (Ⲭ̅ϣ̅ to Ⲭ̅ϣ̅̅).
211. Against Giversen, Apocryphon, p.233, the references to ⲕⲁⲓⲕⲓⲱ  
and ⲁⲡⲟⲥⲧⲁⲥⲓⲁⲓ which BG has, are best interpreted as  
referring to her son's action and boast, and not to Sophia's  
sense of being diminished in light-power, which is the more  
spiritual interpretation of the long recension. Could the future  
tense of BG 45,12 be a half-conscious awareness that originally  
Sophia's repentance came before Ialdabaoth's boast?
212. CG II 13,24; CG IV 21,11.
213. Giversen, Apocryphon, p.232, notes that the Coptic versions  
render the singular ⲉⲡⲁⲓⲛⲱ ⲧⲟⲩ ⲉⲃⲁⲧⲁ of Gen.1:2 by the  
plural form ⲉⲡⲁⲓⲛ ⲁⲙⲟⲩⲉⲓⲟⲟⲩⲉ.
214. BG 45,13-19; CG II 13,23-6; CG IV 21,10-15.
215. H.+M.Schenke, Der Gott "Mensch" in der Gnosis: Eine  
religionsgeschichtlicher Beitrag zur Diskussion über die  
paulinische Anschauung von der Kirche als Leib Christi,  
Göttingen 1962, pp.79-87. He refers to Exc.ex Theod. 47;  
Iren.adv.haer. I 18,1; OnOrWld CG II 100,29 - 101,2;  
104,11-13; Iren.adv.haer. I 30,1. He also finds that Gen.1:2  
has been active in creating myths in as different systems as  
that of the Apophysis Megale and the Sethians of Hippolytus.

216. Der Glaubende, pp.51,53-5. Cf. also the Exegesis on the Soul (Ex Soul) CG II 127,19-129,5.
217. BG 45,20 - 46,15; CG II 13,27 - 14,1; CG IV 21,16 - 22,1.
218. Janssens, art.cit., pp.406f., draws attention to the use of this adjective to describe the chief archon or Ialdabaoth in NatArch CG II 90,29; 92,27 and 94,17 and the use of the substantive  $\alpha\upsilon\delta\alpha\kappa\iota\alpha$  /audacia to describe the nature of the Protarchon in Iren. adv.haer. I 29,4 (Harvey I 226). She also notes the frequent occurrence of the adjective as a title for Pistis Sophia's great enemy in the Pistis Sophia, the lion-faced archon Ialdabaoth (cf. PS Book I ch.31: Schmidt-MacDermot 46.8-22). The adjective is substantive in form in the Apocryphon, as Janssens notes, but still an adjective in the Hypostasis, which she would therefore see as representing the original situation.
219. BG 45,19 - 46,6; CG II 13,27-30; CG IV 21,16-20.
220. BG 46,6-15; CG II 13,30 - 14,1; CG IV 21,20 - 22,1. The long recension, in that it makes Sophia realise that she had not concurred with her consort at the moment she recognised the imperfection, is clearly secondary. She was aware of acting without her consort from the outset. On the Mother's "abortion" (BG 46,10:  $\tau\omicron\gamma\gamma\epsilon$  ) cf. Hipp.Ref. VI 31,2 (Wendland 158.22,25;  $\epsilon\kappa\tau\rho\omega\mu\iota$  ).
221. BG 46,15 - 47,14; CG III 21,2-15; CG III 21,10 reads: "he gave him", which makes no sense, and which Till, on p.134 of his edition suggested emending to agree with BG 47,6 ( $\alpha\gamma\tau\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma\alpha\gamma\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$  ).
222. CG II 14,1-13; CG IV 22,2-15.
223. Cf. TrimProt CG XIII 39,37 - 40,4.
224.  $\epsilon\iota\omega\rho\mu$  here is evidently the Sahidic of  $\chi\omega\rho\mu$  , which represents the Greek  $\chi\omega\rho\epsilon\iota\mu$  ,  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\chi\omega\rho\epsilon\iota\mu$  etc. (cf. Crum, Dictionary, 785b), and thus CG IV here is closer to the short recension. Krause has translated the other verb  $\epsilon\iota\omega\rho\mu$  , which does mean "stare" or "be amazed" (cf. Crum, ibid., 84ab).
225. CG II 14,7-9; CG IV 22,8-11.

226. CG II 14,11-13; CG IV 22,13-15.
227. Der Glaubende, p.49.
228. Apocryphon, pp.235,238.
229. BG 37,5f.; CG III 14,22f. Janssens, art.cit., pp.408f., identifies the spirit shed on the Mother as the male virginal spirit.
230. CG II 9,32f.
231. BG 60,12-14; CG III 30,11f.
232. CG II 23,14-22; CG IV 36,9-14. On this cf. Schottroff, Der Glaubende, p.57.
233. Cf. e.g. Iren.adv.haer. I 4,5 (Harvey I 38); Exc.ex Theod. 43,5 (Sagnard 152-6); TriTrac CG I 80,11 - 81,35; 86,4 - 87,31, etc.
234. Cf. Iren. adv.haer. I 29,4 (Harvey I 226).
235. Cf. TrimProt. CG XIII 39,32 - 40,29.
236. Giversen, Apocryphon, pp.236f. argues that "the Ninth" (BG 47,12  $\tau\mu\epsilon\zeta\psi\iota\tau\epsilon$  ; CG III 21,14f.,  $\tau\mu\alpha\zeta\psi\iota[\tau\epsilon]$  ; CG II 14,12  $\pi\mu\alpha\zeta\psi\iota\tau$  ) must be understood as an ordinal qualifying either  $\alpha\iota\omega\nu$  (m.) or  $\tau\epsilon$  (f.), and therefore rejects Till's translation "Neunheit" (on p.135 of his edition), on the grounds that the Coptic does not form a collective that way. But what of BG 42,8 ( $\tau\mu\epsilon\zeta\alpha\omega\gamma\epsilon$  ) which clearly represents the Coptic of  $\epsilon\beta\delta\omega\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  , which CG III 18,7, CG II 11,34f. and CG IV 18,25 preserve? For the term  $\epsilon\upsilon\theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$  /  $\zeta\epsilon\nu\eta\alpha\varsigma$  cf. On the Eighth and Ninth (On 8th9th) CG VI 56,26; 59,31; 61,22; 63,14.
237. See n.192.
238. Der Glaubende, pp. 55f. To her references one might add Iren.adv.haer. I 29,4 (Harvey I 226); Epiph.Pan. XXV 2,2 (Holl 1,269.3); XL 2,3 (Holl 2,82.20); Poim. CH I 26; NatArch CG II 95,33f.; OnOrWld CG II 104,30f.; 106,7f.; 112, 12.20.

239. Cf. CG II 11,5f.
240. Cf. CG II 14,11; IV 22,13.
241. Cf. PGM XIII 744,754 (Preisendanz 2,121).
242. Cf. On8th9th CG VI 62,20 - 63,14.
243. Cf. ZRGG 14(1962)pp.57-63. The Epistle of Eugnostos demonstrates that a Gnostic work can comprise a cosmogony only, with almost no trace of anthropology or soteriology, while the Hypostasis of the Archons demonstrates that a Gnostic work can begin with the boast of the Demiurge that he alone is God, and be largely concerned with a reinterpretation of Genesis.
244. Cf. e.g. Basilides frag. 1 in Hegemonius, Acta Archelai 67,7-12 (C.H. Beeson GCS 16, Leipzig 1906, 96.24 - 97.24); ParShem CG VII 1,25 - 3,29.
245. On Sophia creating without her partner cf. Hipp. Ref. VI 30,7 (Wendland 158.1f.); on her offspring as an abortion (BG 46,10) cf. Hipp. Ref. VI 31,2 (Wendland 158.22,25); Iren. adv. haer. I 2,3 (Harvey I 16f.); on Ialdabaoth's creation in the image of the heavenly world cf. Iren. adv. haer. I 5,1 (Harvey I 43); on his boast cf. Iren. adv. haer. I 5,4 (Harvey I 47); on Sophia's repentance etc. cf. TriTrac CG I 80,11 - 82,4; 86,4 - 87,17; ValExp CG XI 34,23-31; on the single Sophia and the negative view of the Demiurge cf. Exc. ex Theod. 33,3-4 (Sagnard 130-4).



## CHAPTER THREE

Gnostic Anthropogony and Anthropology

The famous and much quoted definition of the essence of Valentinian gnosis in Excerpta ex Theodoto 78,2 reads "Now it is not merely the washing ( λουτρὸν ) which liberates, but also the knowledge ( γνῶσις ): Who were we? what have we become? where were we? into what place have we been cast? whither are we hastening? from what have we been delivered? what is birth? what is rebirth?" It encapsulates the heart of the Gnostic problem: the nature, origin and destiny of man, estranged from his heavenly home and origin, imprisoned in this visible universe under the domination of hostile powers, in need of a heavenly redeemer to rouse him from his oblivion, reveal his true origin and destiny, and ensure his ultimate escape from this world. Thus Gnostic anthropology forms the heart and pivot of Gnostic theology, but it cannot be properly understood apart from both cosmology and soteriology. Thus in our treatment of Gnostic anthropology and our investigation into how and why it developed we will necessarily have to overlap with the previous cosmological chapter and also deal with material which properly belongs to the following soteriological and christological chapter.

If there is one point of agreement in the bewildering plethora of Gnostic systems and theologies it would appear to be that man is composite, a mixture of hostile and heterogeneous elements, of light



and darkness, good and evil, spirit and matter, corporeal and incorporeal. Even a system such as that of Basilides which appears to function without any of the elements commonly characterized as Gnostic (i.e. the dualism spirit - matter or God - world; the fall of a divine being into the evil world of the archons and matter; the subordinate ignorant and arrogant creator god who is hostile to the Unknown Father or mediates between him and the visible cosmos), begins with an original mixture, the 'world-seed'. Salvation is a matter of unscrambling this original mixture, of distinguishing the various kinds.<sup>1</sup> Such a mixture can result from an original monism, as with Basilides, or from an original dualism, as with the Manichees. The power or powers which are responsible for the creation of earthly man can be seen both as hostile, as with the Hypostasis of the Archons, or as unwitting agents in the divine plan of salvation, as with the Ophites, the Apocryphon of John and the Valentinians of Ptolemaeus' school. Thus, too, we find both a dichotomous anthropology<sup>2</sup> and a trichotomous anthropology,<sup>3</sup> sometimes a combination of both,<sup>4</sup> or even a fourfold scheme.<sup>5</sup> At the heart of this rather bewildering variety, however, lies the same basic conception: man is a mixture of divine and anti-divine elements, and the various, often inconsistent, anthropologies are attempts to do justice to this insight and this dilemma; to allow for the fact that man is the creation of - and under the sway of - cosmic forces hostile to the Unknown Father, the ultimate origin

of man's divine spark, yet to attempt to delimit as far as possible the extent of that sway and preserve the divine spark uncontaminated. It is not so much simply that man is, in the Platonic sense, a divine soul trapped in an earthly body; Gnosticism is much more pessimistic than Platonism about human nature. No, the dilemma that Gnostic anthropology wrestles with is that the soul itself originates from the inferior powers hostile to God; that the divine element is therefore not to be equated simply with the rational soul, as a natural endowment or faculty. Rather it is purely divine and spiritual, an element from the supra-heavenly sphere, above the creators of the visible (and invisible)cosmos.

Thus the Gnostic anthropologies which deal most satisfactorily with the dilemma of man's nature, origin and destiny are those which suggest that the divine element is something in addition to the natural elements found in all men, i.e. body and soul according to the simplest anthropological model. Therefore, attempts to see in the dichotomous anthropology of Saturninus the earliest and simplest form of Gnostic anthropology: man's body is created by angels, then animated by the spark of life from heaven which leaves him at death,<sup>6</sup> fail to notice the inconsistency in Saturninus' account. His anthropology apparently demands that all men possess this spark of life; his soteriology, however, insists that it is only those who believe in the Saviour who possess it.<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, Saturninus has yet another anthropological

theory which is equally inconsistent with his original one; that there are two types or races of men, one good, the other bad.<sup>8</sup> One cannot reconcile the two theories by arguing that the good men are those with the spark of life. In the former case too the Saviour comes to destroy the hostile God of the Jews and his angels; in the latter, however, the opponents appear to be the evil angels and Satan, who is already independent of, and hostile to the Old Testament God and his fellow creator angels.

Thus in the case of Saturninus, assuming that Irenaeus or his source have given us an accurate account of his views, we are forced to realise that he is not giving us a consistent theology, but rather a series of mutually inconsistent anthropological views or myths which cast light on man's dilemma. Here we can isolate certainly two and, more tentatively, three strands which we will find recurring in Gnostic texts. The first theory or myth deals with the motif of the divine spark which is present in men, and explains its descent by means of the motif of man created by angels in the image of a heavenly being reflected in the waters of chaos. The second theory or myth suggests that originally angels, perhaps divided into good and evil, created two types or races of men, one evil, the other good. The third theory, if we can speak of it as such, seems to presuppose three powers or principles (and thus by implication, three elements or races): the supreme unknown power, the world-creating angels, including the God of the Old

Testament, and Satan, who is responsible for human and animal generation, and thus represents the evil nature of matter.

The first theory occurs in varied guises from that of the *Poimandres*<sup>9</sup> where Primal Man descends to enter his irrational form, his reflection with which he has fallen in love, and, united with the female Nature, produces men in his image, to that of the *Untitled Treatise*<sup>10</sup> according to which Light Adam appears to the archons who are then encouraged by the Demiurge Ialdabaoth to create a man of earth in their image and in the likeness of the heavenly Adam, as a means of making the heavenly figure fall in love with their creature and thus not destroy it. The second theory recalls both the Christian legends about the races of Cain and of Seth<sup>11</sup> and the views of the Sethians according to Epiphanius.<sup>12</sup> The third theory, suggesting that there are three principles or three substances and races, occurs frequently, in such varying forms as Valentinianism<sup>13</sup> and the Naassene system.<sup>14</sup>

Attempts have been made by various scholars since the beginning of this century to isolate what they consider to be the key to Gnostic anthropology and they have tended to select one or two out of three central themes which occur in the three theories expounded above. Thus there is (1) the idea of the descent or fall of Primal Man, either (a) directly as in the *Poimandres* or (b) in the form of his reflection being seen and copied, which leads to the descent of a divine spark, as

in Saturninus and the Hypostasis of the Archons. However some have taken (2) the motif of man made in the image of the divine Man reflected in the waters of chaos as the central anthropological thesis of Gnosticism. Others have insisted that the fundamental tenet is rather (3) the idea of the consubstantiality of the salvandus and the Salvator or Redeemer. That is, either the supreme God himself, or, since this is an impossible thought for Gnostics, his primary emanation and image, the heavenly Primal Man, is actually present in earthly man, i.e. motif (1a) or, avoiding that risky conception, his image or reflection is somehow present in earthly man and thus heavenly Primal Man does not fall, i.e. motif (2), or a divine spark or seed or spirit from heavenly Man is present in earthly man, i.e. motifs (1b) and (3). The first thesis is represented by Bousset<sup>15</sup> and Reitzenstein.<sup>16</sup> Bousset argued that there had been an archaic myth which recounted how the world originated from the sacrifice of the Primal Man and was formed from his body.<sup>17</sup> This myth of the primal giant, a cosmogonic myth, was the root of the Gnostic view of the divine Man who fell into matter, which was then adapted to express the origin of earthly man. However, as Schenke points out,<sup>18</sup> the only Gnostic texts in which the Primal Man, Anthropos, occurs as a cosmogonic principle are Manichean. Reizenstein argued that the Gnostic conceptions of a divine Man developed on the basis of pre-Christian Iranian conceptions according to which the soul or the inner

man, seen as a divine being, was sent down from the world of light into matter, freed from it and recalled to heaven.<sup>19</sup> Primal Man is here essentially a 'redeemed Redeemer'. It is perhaps worth noting that both Bousset and Reitzenstein claimed to find support for their theory of a pre-Christian cosmogonic (only secondarily anthropogonic) Ἀνθρωπος myth in the Naassene Preaching,<sup>20</sup> which Reitzenstein claimed had been interpolated.<sup>21</sup> This claim has been contested by Schottroff,<sup>22</sup> who also casts doubt on the whole assumption of a Primal Man-Redeemer, or a 'redeemed Redeemer' (salvator- salvandus) myth underlying Gnosticism and Christianity.<sup>23</sup>

The hypothesis of an Iranian Primal Man as put forward by Reitzenstein and others of the religionsgeschichtliche Schule had already been attacked by Quispel.<sup>24</sup> He argued that the original Primal Man myth had been a myth of Sophia, the virgin of light, casting her Eidolon, her shadow image, on to primal water, from which the hostile archons created the world and man's body.<sup>25</sup> In its earliest beginnings this Sophia myth had been dependent on certain Hellenistic ideas. The first figure to appear was the female anima mundi of late Platonism, which later became the male Anthropos figure.<sup>26</sup> Quispel thus takes as the key to understanding Gnostic cosmogony and anthropogony the second thesis, of man made in the image of God. He finds this basic theme in the Apocryphon of John and comments: "Schon hier begegnet uns das eigentliche Thema der gnostischen Anthropologie, das

Verhältnis vom göttlichen Urbild und menschlichen Abbild, welches als eine Einheit und Wesensgleichheit der Gegensätze aufgefasst wird. Dieses Thema kehrt nur . . . . . in tausendfachen Variationen in der Geschichte der Gnosis wieder ".<sup>27</sup>

J. Jervell precisely echoes this same theme: the key to understanding the Gnostic system is the term εἰκών . He points out that complete Gnostic systems known to us deal with the same theme: the relationship between the heavenly image (Vorbild) and the earthly copy (Abbild).<sup>28</sup> Jervell suggests that the term εἰκών encompasses the two chief concerns of Gnostic theology; (1) the essential unity of divine and human pneuma as regards soteriology, and (2), as regards eschatology, the equally necessary distance between divine and human spheres.<sup>29</sup>

Jervell argues against the Bousset-Reitzenstein thesis that in all likelihood pre-Christian gnosis such as that underlying the Poimandres knew of no redeemer figure called Anthropos, and that it was only under Christian influence that he became a redeemer.<sup>30</sup> But equally he rejects Quispel's argument that the figure of Anthropos was secondary to that of Sophia and argues that Sophia replaced Anthropos, which alone would explain why an Anthropos tradition survives in Sophia tradition but not vice versa.<sup>31</sup> For Jervell the Anthropos figure is primary in Gnostic theology: he is the Father himself as he projects himself as Eikon, and all the Gnostic systems and their cosmological, anthropological, and soteriological theories are variations on the



theme of the self-projection and self-revelation of the divine Anthropos. Thus Gen. 1 : 26 is used as the basic anthropological and soteriological text, outlining the heavenly birth of Primal Man. The earthly man is a copy of the heavenly; being in the image means that the divine spirit lives in man. Thus only the divine pneuma is in the image of God.<sup>32</sup>

However, despite the value of Jervell's analysis of the way the Eikon motif occurs, as his conclusion above demonstrates, he is forced to include within the Eikon motif the idea of the divine spark or pneuma, which alone is the true image. As his examination of the use of the Eikon motif in relation to Gen 1 : 26 demonstrates, in many cases it is absent,<sup>33</sup> and in a significant number of the remaining texts cited it has a negative significance in that earthly man is made in the image of the divine Anthropos as a bait to trap or control him, or he is made in the image of the Demiurge and his archons.<sup>34</sup> The cosmogonic function of the Eikon motif appears to be to explain the process of emanation in the heavenly realm where what is stressed is not so much the similarity of the image (Abbild) as its inferiority in power etc.<sup>35</sup> But if the Eikon motif is not universal and is frequently used in a negative fashion to explain how this present hostile world arose and how the divine is trapped in and mixed with matter, the anthropological and soteriological motif which occurs in all the Gnostic texts at present available is that of our third thesis: the idea of the consubstantiality of salvandus and salvator, of a divine spark, spirit,

intelligence, seed (even sometimes 'inner man') which is present in man, or rather in the elect. This motif expresses the basic anthropological dualism of Gnostic theology to which both Jonas and Schottroff have drawn attention;<sup>36</sup> of the Gnostic self (however that may be expressed), and soul, or psychic element or body (or however the hostile element in man is understood).<sup>37</sup>

As will become clear from an analysis of Gnostic anthropology, the theme of consubstantiality can and does embrace the motifs of heavenly Primal Man somehow present in earthly man, of heavenly Anthropos and man made in his image, and of the two, or three races, types and substances.<sup>38</sup> How far the spiritual element or substance is a natural endowment which ensures salvation "by nature" (the  $\phiύσει σωζόμενος$  of some Valentinians) which Bultmann would see as the essence of Gnostic soteriology;<sup>39</sup> or a means of expressing the certainty of divine grace, of being one of the elect, a consequence of revelation, as Quispel has argued;<sup>40</sup> or simply a way of expressing the fact that the Gnostic is saved by grace but that salvation is not an assured possession, as Schottroff insists,<sup>41</sup> we will have to determine from our detailed analysis of the texts. The question is, of course, primarily a soteriological one and thus will have to be treated in the chapter following. However the two doctrines are interdependent, or rather soteriology governs anthropology, and thus some discussion of the anthropological aspects of the theme of consubstantiality is necessary.

Our procedure will depart slightly from the pattern established in previous chapters, since the parallel account in adv. haer. I 29 terminated with the boast of the Demiurge marking the end of the cosmogony. Since, however, the Ophite system in the following chapter in Irenaeus exhibits certain similarities and is evidently related, if distantly, to the Apocryphon, and has been identified by Irenaeus as a source of Valentinianism, we shall take the Apocryphon and adv. haer. I 30 as our basic framework. We shall, of course, consider the questions of the relationship of the versions of the Apocryphon and its possible influence on Valentinianism, but we shall concentrate more on analysing the various mythological motifs in the two texts,<sup>42</sup> comparing them with similar or parallel usages in related texts, in an attempt to discover what theological factors govern the selection and interpretation of the material. We shall endeavour to see if we can discern an underlying Gnostic theological impetus uniting the texts, and isolate possible lines of development, to test the claims of ancient and modern scholars that the Barbelognostic and Ophite systems and the Apocryphon supplied the foundations for Valentinianism. The significance both of the Apocryphon of John and of the Ophite system in adv. haer. I 30 with regard to Gnostic anthropology is evident from the priority the two texts have received at the hands of ancient and modern writers. Thus Irenaeus' account in ch. 30 is the largest section in his catalogue of heresies in Book One, and

Schottroff gives it comprehensive treatment in her book alongside the Apocryphon.<sup>43</sup> Indeed she takes as the central theme not only of the Ophite system but also of Gnostic theology in general the statement, "uti neque maledictionem participaret, neque opprobrium, is qui esset a principalitate spiritus", which she interprets as the attempt to establish the unassailed and unassailable integrity of the divine element.<sup>44</sup> Quispel finds the original form of his projected Jewish-Gnostic myth readily recognisable in the Apocryphon and in Irenaeus I 30.<sup>45</sup> Rudolph begins his attempt to trace the development of Gnostic Primal Man speculation with the Apocryphon since he considers it to be of extraordinary importance for the history of Gnosis, being demonstrably the source of Irenaeus adv. haer. I 29.<sup>46</sup>

The initial anthropogonical impulse: Ialdabaoth's arrogant boast and the response from heaven

The motif of the hubris of the Demiurge clothed in the language of the God of the Old Testament (Is. 45: 5f.; 46: 9 etc.) recurs frequently in the heresiologists' accounts and in the Gnostic texts from Nag Hammadi,<sup>47</sup> although the context, the Old Testament allusions, and the response from heaven take different forms. Thus while all the texts attest the allusion to Isaiah: "there is no other (god) beside me", only four, the Apocryphon of John, the Gospel of the Egyptians, the Second Treatise of the Great Seth and Irenaeus' account of the Barbelognostics begin with Ialdabaoth calling himself a

jealous god in an allusion to Exod. 20: 5.<sup>48</sup> But, despite the differences, a number of texts, such as adv. haer. I 30, the Gospel of the Egyptians, the Untitled Treatise from Codex II and the Hypostasis of the Archons agree in having Ialdabaoth's boast immediately followed by a voice from heaven generally associated with Sophia, which indicates Ialdabaoth's error and in several cases affirms the existence of a superior heavenly being or beings, Man and the Son of Man.<sup>49</sup>

But although the Apocryphon does contain the motif of the heavenly voice which affirms the existence of Man and the Son of Man,<sup>50</sup> this is separated from his boast by the passage concerning the repentance and partial restoration of the Mother. Furthermore, she is not the author of the reproof as in adv. haer. I 30 and the Untitled Treatise from Codex II; it comes to her, and Ialdabaoth also hears it and thinks that it came from his mother.<sup>51</sup> In the light of the other evidence already adduced to suggest the secondary nature of the passage between Ialdabaoth's boast and the reply from heaven, the hypothesis that the Apocryphon has changed the order of events at this point and destroyed the original unity of boast and reply would appear to receive further confirmation. That the voice should come to Sophia is, as Schottroff has convincingly demonstrated, explicable in terms of the Apocryphon's consistent reinterpretation of the figure of Sophia which attempts to remove all trace of the idea that she was a redeemer.<sup>52</sup> That Ialdabaoth thinks the voice came from his mother<sup>53</sup> not only

suggests his ignorance but also perhaps that the voice was female, and that the original pattern which the Apocryphon has changed did indeed have the voice issuing from his mother.<sup>54</sup>

The formula "Man exists and the Son of Man" occurs in two of the three texts which unite the two titles, the Apocryphon and the Gospel of the Egyptians, in almost precisely the same wording in the five documents involved.<sup>55</sup> The Ophite version<sup>56</sup> is rather different and runs: "... there is above you the Father of all, the First Man (primus Anthropus /  $\pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\varsigma \text{'Ανθρωπος}$ ) and Man, the Son of Man (Anthropus filius Anthropi /  $\υ\iota\omicron\varsigma \text{'Ανθρωπου}$  )."<sup>57</sup> Conversely we have in the Untitled Treatise reference merely to Man: "..... an immortal light Man exists before you!"<sup>58</sup>

The question arises which of these versions is primary. F.H. Borsch points out that because the Untitled Treatise's statement is shorter and there seem no obvious reasons why mention of the Son of Man should have been omitted, and also in the light of comparative material such as the Poimandres which refers only to the heavenly Man, the version without the Son of Man reference could be regarded as primary, the Son of Man being added as a result of Christian influence.<sup>59</sup> However he prefers the opposite supposition, that in view of the preponderance of the versions which do speak of the Son of Man, and of the much earlier date of Irenaeus's account as compared with that of the Nag Hammadi documents in their present form,

the texts which have Man and Son of Man must be considered primary.<sup>60</sup> Borsch also suggests that Irenaeus' peculiar version might be explained as the result either of his attempt to combine two variants of the heavenly retort or of his use of a version which had interpolated a reference to the Son of Man, or alternatively of his conscious or unconscious attempt to interpret the statement he found by identifying the son of Man, Jesus, with the Man.<sup>61</sup> He finally suggests that Irenaeus may have preserved a more Semitic understanding in which the Son of Man is understood to be a counterpart or an appositional way of speaking about the Man and not a distinct entity.<sup>62</sup>

Despite the value of Borsch's suggestions, however, they do not furnish an explanation of the two basic versions of the retort, with or without the Son of Man, in terms of the texts themselves. We have to ask what is the significance of the retort in its context; what part the figure(s.) mentioned play in the rest of the system; and what the background is to the figure of Man and Son of Man in Gnostic theology, as revealed by these and other texts which deal with them.

As regards the context we should note that in all the texts, apart from Irenaeus' account, the blasphemy of the Demiurge and the retort from heaven is immediately followed by the appearance of a heavenly being whose image is reflected in the waters below, and that this initiates the creation of earthly man in accordance with the heavenly image.<sup>63</sup> Although Irenaeus' account does not employ the motif of the



heavenly image seen by the archons, it does have the idea of a mental image of man supplied to the six powers by Sophia when they respond to Ialdabaoth's command "Let us make man in our image".<sup>64</sup> We shall consider the motif of the image in due course: what is important here is that despite the variations and the fact that only in the Apocryphon do we get a complete and unified picture which the other texts appear to abridge (Gospel of the Egyptians), split up (Untitled Treatise) or adapt (Irenaeus' account), the mention of heavenly Man is firmly associated with the creation of earthly Adam.

But the question arises: is this the original context of the figure of heavenly Man (and the Son of Man)? Is he limited to anthropology or does he not also have a cosmological and soteriological role? If so, which is primary? Is the heavenly Anthropos of Gnostic theology derived from an ancient near Eastern myth, a descendant of the Iranian Gayomart, or is he a projection into heaven of the glorified Adam of Jewish post- and extra-biblical tradition? We cannot attempt to give a comprehensive answer within the limits of this chapter, but can, through our analysis of the texts, attempt to cast some light on a very obscure and much debated problem.

Thus in attempting to answer the question regarding the role of Man and Son of Man with reference to the Apocryphon and Irenaeus I, 29 and 30, we have to enquire first, precisely who is being referred to. In the case of the Ophites the answer appears to be self-evident:

Sophia is referring to the two supreme deities mentioned at the outset, the First light (ϕῶς in Theodoret) the Father of All, First Man, and his Ennoia proceeding from him, entitled his Son, the Son of Man, Second Man.<sup>65</sup> However elsewhere in the text it appears that Christ, the Son of First and Second Man and the Holy Spirit can also be called Son of Man.<sup>66</sup> Certainly Second Man plays no further part in the proceedings and the key figures in the drama of salvation besides Sophia and her Mother are First Man and Christ.<sup>67</sup>

What then is the significance of the figure of Son of Man, Second Man? He is represented as the emanation or hypostatisation of the Father's thought, and can thus be considered as bisexual. Together with the Father, First Man, he illuminates the subordinate female figure of Holy Spirit, also called 'Mother of the living', and generates an incorruptible light, the third male, Christ.<sup>68</sup> This also indirectly causes the Holy Spirit to overflow and the resulting figure of Sophia Prunicus, also androgynous and the sister of Christ, is responsible for the rest of the visible creation.<sup>69</sup> The pattern of Man, his hypostatised thought which becomes or is called Son of Man, and their offspring the Saviour is strikingly reminiscent of the theogony of the Epistle of Eugnostos, as Borsch notes.<sup>70</sup> There the second deity, the self-produced Father, the reflection of the Forefather,<sup>71</sup> is responsible for the appearance through the mediation of a certain Archē (first principle? female deity?)<sup>72</sup> of an immortal bisexual

Man who unites with his consort the Great Sophia to produce the bisexual Son of Man, whose feminine name is "Primal Mother (  $\pi\rho\omega\tau\omicron\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha$  ) Sophia, the Mother of the All".<sup>73</sup> He in turn unites with his consort and produces a great bisexual light, whose masculine name is "the Saviour" and whose feminine is "Sophia, Mother of All (  $\pi\alpha\nu\gamma\epsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\epsilon\rho\alpha$  ).... Pistis".<sup>74</sup>

Now the Christianization of Egnostos to form the Sophia of Jesus Christ, which Krause has convincingly demonstrated,<sup>75</sup> appears to have led to an obscuring of the original pattern.<sup>76</sup> This may also be true of the Ophite system. Thus what strikes us as odd, i.e. the mating of the Holy Spirit with both Man and Son of Man to produce Christ, may be due to the attempts to reproduce a kind of Christian Trinity whereby Father, Son and Holy Spirit are jointly responsible for the production of the Saviour, Christ.<sup>77</sup> Some patristic attempts to preserve the transcendence of the Trinity when speaking of the Incarnation of the Logos do come near to suggesting the kind of quaternity in the Godhead which the Ophite picture suggests. The union of Man and Son of Man would, of course, also allow Christ really to be and to be called Son of Man (i.e. of the Father, First Man), and such an identification would perhaps also explain the virtual redundancy of Second Man, Son of Man, apart from his theogonic role and the reference to him in the reproof from heaven.<sup>78</sup>

The author of the Sophia, in what we have argued is his attempt

to harmonize the pattern of Egnostos (Man, Son of Man, son of Son of Man) with Christianity, interpolates a question by Bartholomew to Christ which runs: "How in the gospel ( εὐαγγέλιον ) was he called 'the Man' and 'The Son of Man'? from which of them is this son?"<sup>79</sup>

Then follows the section in Egnostos which deals with the appearance of the Son of Man.<sup>80</sup> It is fragmentary but does not appear to echo

or have room for the Sophia's identification of this being as "the Son of God, that is the Christ",<sup>81</sup> or "who is wont to be called 'the

Christ'".<sup>82</sup> Thus while the Ophites identify Christ with the third male (son of Son of Man?), the author of the Sophia prefers to echo the statements about the Son of Man put in the mouth of Jesus in the four Gospels. But while all four do speak of 'the Son of Man' they do not represent Jesus referring to 'Man' or 'Man and Son of Man'.

Borsch suggests that the reference to "the Gospel" might refer either to the Egnostos letter or some common source or more probably to the general stock of belief and tradition in which both titles are found closely linked.<sup>83</sup> In a footnote he finds it at least possible that

Bartholomew is referring to the Gospel of Philip or the Gospel of the Egyptians where both titles are joined.<sup>84</sup>

The fact of Egnostos, a non- if not pre-Christian work, having the Son of Man as a divine being with a theogonic role; the way in which the Ophites do not identify him with Christ and make it clear that Christ is the third male and, if Son of Man, Son of First Man;

and the difficulties the author of the Sophia has in identifying him with Christ, all suggest support for Borsch's thesis that the Son of Man here is not derived from the Christian use of the title.<sup>85</sup> There is one passage in the New Testament, although not in the Gospels, in which "Man" and "Son of Man" are linked, and that is Hebrews 2:6f. which quotes Psalm 8:5f. *Τὸ ἐόντι ἀνθρώπου... ἢ οἷος ἀνθρώπου...*; with reference to the fact that God has not subjected the world to angels, but to man. This has not yet been fully accomplished, but in Jesus, the Son of God, we see the pioneer of our salvation. In the previous chapter the author has been demonstrating the superiority of the Son to the angels by appeal to texts which speak of God begetting a son or being a Father to a son (Ps.2: 7; 2 Sam.7: 14), of the angels worshipping him (Deut.32: 43 LXX), of the Son's exaltation (Ps.45: 6-7) and his creative role (Ps. 102: 25-7) and status at God's right hand (Ps.110: 1). Here what is being stressed is the pre-existence of the Son and his role in creation - and it is in this guise that we find the Gnostic Son of Man frequently appears. It may well be, then, that we should look to ideas arising from a Jewish milieu, interpretations based on the Man and Son of Man of Ps.8: 5, to cast light on the heavenly retort in several Gnostic documents: "Man exists and the Son of Man!"

Borsch notes that the pattern, Man, Son of Man and a second son, seen as the Saviour, also occurs in the Gospel of Philip.<sup>86</sup> Thus in

saying 54 the Lord (i.e. Christ) speaks of the coming of "the son of the Son of Man",<sup>87</sup> in the context of dyeing, which may be a reference to baptism. If we complete the lacuna in line 30 ["as a dyer"],<sup>88</sup> the reference would be to the Saviour baptising the Gnostics. However, as Borsch notes, if the Lord is the Son of Man and we retain the reading "son of the Son of Man", this would refer to the Gnostic, born through this process of dyeing or baptism.<sup>89</sup>

This same usage seems to recur in saying 102<sup>90</sup> which is concerned with the way in which each species produces its own distinct kind. Thus the elect, the children of the bridal chamber, are called "the chosen race of the [Father of All?]<sup>91</sup> and the true Man and the Son of Man and the seed ( σπέρμα ) of the Son of Man". Probably, as Borsch suggests,<sup>92</sup> all these names apply to the group and are thus in apposition. But comparison with the usage of e.g. the Apocryphon of John or the Gospel of the Egyptians with reference to the seed of Seth<sup>93</sup> might suggest that the first three titles are in the genitive and that the fourth, ("the seed of the Son of Man"), is another title for the Gnostics. They would thus be descended directly from the Son of Man (Seth?) and ultimately from the Father of All and First Man.

This interpretation would appear to be borne out by saying 120 which reads: "There is the Son of Man and there is the son of the Son of Man. The Lord is the Son of Man and the son of the Son of Man is he who is created through the Son of Man. The Son of Man received from

God (the power) to create. It is (also) his to beget".<sup>94</sup> Again the context concerns creating and begetting, as Borsch points out, and he is probably justified in interpreting the title "Lord" as applying to Jesus, the cosmic Son of Man with creative power from God from whom he is distinguished, and in identifying "the son of the Son of Man" with the Gnostic believer.<sup>95</sup> The distinction between creating and begetting which continues in the following saying points to the fact that the Son of Man is not a creature and has a twofold activity, the visible creative process which produces creatures (sons of the Son of Man) and the invisible spiritual process of begetting which produces natural spiritual offspring.<sup>96</sup> In the latter case the expression "son of the Son of Man" could apply both to the Gnostic and to the Saviour, who in Eugnostos is entitled the son of the Son of Man. Therefore the reference to the coming of the son of the Son of Man in saying 54 could apply to the Saviour as well as to the Gnostics. This ambivalence of course recalls the feature we have suggested is a central characteristic of Gnostic anthropology and soteriology, the consubstantiality of salvator and salvandus.

The same theme can also be traced in Irenaeus's account of the Ophites. The overflow from Holy Spirit could be said to be the "offspring" of her union with the Son of Man (and First Man), and Sophia Prunicus is indeed both the sister of the Saviour and the source of the heavenly element which is concealed in certain men, who can



thus be said to be, in a certain sense, consubstantial with Sophia and Christ, her brother and consort.

The combination of Man and Son of Man, the latter being the source of all creation, is also found in Hippolytus' account of the view of Monoimus "the Arabian".<sup>97</sup> Monoimus speaks of Man as "the All", the Beginning ( ἀρχή ) of the All, unoriginate, incorruptible and eternal,<sup>98</sup> the monad who comprises all opposites,<sup>99</sup> the perfect invisible Man.<sup>100</sup> His son the Son of Man is described conversely as originate ( γενητός ) and susceptible to suffering ( παθητός ) but generated without time, without will, without forethought.<sup>101</sup> Men, in ignorance of his origin, think that he was born of a woman, but he controls the world-process and it is he, not his Father, Man, who is responsible for the creation which derives from part of him.<sup>102</sup> He is represented as the iota with its superscript mark, i.e. the number ten which includes all the other numbers, this single letter being the image of the monad, the perfect man.<sup>103</sup> The Son of Man is thus the image of his Father and has in himself all that his Father has.<sup>104</sup> As corroboration of this Monoimus appeals to the saying "because the whole fullness ( πληρώμα ) was pleased ( εὐδόκησεν ) to reside in the Son of Man in bodily form ( σωματικῶς )."<sup>105</sup>

Evidence of Christian influence, although slight, does appear here, particularly in the description of the Son of Man as passible but as generated timelessly or instantaneously - like light along with fire -<sup>106</sup>

and in the echoes of John 1: 1-3 and the combination of two verses in Colossians which Wendland has detected. The concept of the creator Son, generate and passible, the image of the Father, who entered our realm, was thought to be born of a woman and who endured suffering to pioneer our salvation, which we can perhaps detect under Monoimus' account, is remarkably similar to the picture presented by Hebrews, and thus it is perhaps better to set it in the context of the descent of the divine Saviour who in some sense suffers, a theme we will find frequently occurring in Gnostic texts, than suggest, as Borsch does,<sup>107</sup> that the passible Son of Man here is a reference to the creation of the first earthly man when compared to his heavenly prototype.

Finally, in the context of systems which speak of Man and Son of Man we must consider the Naassenes,<sup>108</sup> whose ideas reveal numerous parallels with Monoimus' views. Thus they honour above all Man and Son of Man.<sup>109</sup> However, as is clear from Hippolytus' résumé in Book X, Man and the Son of Man are here regarded as one and the same.<sup>110</sup> This figure is bisexual and is called Adamas,<sup>111</sup> and Hippolytus quotes a hymn to him as Father and Mother which has a precise parallel in Monoimus.<sup>112</sup> It is clear that he himself is not the supreme deity; knowledge of him, as the Naassenes repeat several times, is merely the beginning of perfection, whereas knowledge of (the supreme) God is complete perfection.<sup>113</sup> This supreme being is described as ineffable, unimaginable, inconceivable, and formless,<sup>114</sup> the unmoved

mover,<sup>115</sup> the uncharacterized being,<sup>116</sup> the Father of the All, the pre-existent being who begot his invisible, unnameable and unutterable Son, i.e. Adamas, the subject of Hippolytus' account.<sup>117</sup>

Earthly man is an image ( εἰκών ) of this heavenly Man Adamas according to the view of "the Chaldeans" which the Naassenes cite.<sup>118</sup> They appear to interpret this to mean that although man is made by many powers, he is somehow the creature or creaturely form ( πλάσμα ) of the heavenly Man,<sup>119</sup> the moulded clay receptacle of a soul which has been conveyed down from this blessed Man or Archanthropos ( ἀρχάνθρωπος ) or Adamas to serve the artificer of this (visible) creation, Esaldaeus, the fiery god, fourth in number, i.e. the Demiurge.<sup>120</sup> This created form or soul can also be designated "Adamas" and "inner man" fallen from the heavenly Adamas into the earthly, clayey creature.<sup>121</sup> It can also be described as "spiritual man". Thus the two statues of naked men in the temple of the Samothracians are interpreted as images respectively of the Primal Man ( ἀρχάνθρωπος ) and of the regenerated spiritual man who is in every respect consubstantial ( ὁμοούσιος ) with him.<sup>122</sup> Once again we have the motif of consubstantiality, and again it appears to involve the salvandus and the salvator. For the figure of Primal Man, or Adamas, is not only depicted as the manifestation of the invisible Father and his agent in creating the universe, Hermes or the Logos from the uncharacterized being,<sup>123</sup> but he is also represented as the Saviour,

the Christ, characterized as Son of Man from the uncharacterized Logos,<sup>124</sup> who descends incognito into an earthly body,<sup>125</sup> the great and perfect Illuminator ( φωσ τη'ρ ) coming from the uncharacterized one.<sup>126</sup>

This picture of the ineffable, unnameable supreme deity, his son, Adamas (Primal Man, Son of Man, Hermes, Logos etc), who appears in various guises in pagan mythology and in the Old Testament and who plays the central role in creation, including the creation of man, and salvation, in that he is present incognito in the spiritual regenerated men and leads them back to the heaven from where they originated, can be derived from the text, even if, with Reitzenstein, one removes all of the New Testament and many of the Old Testament citations and allusions.<sup>127</sup> However, even Reitzenstein cannot remove all the Old Testament allusions, nor can he omit the key antitheses spiritual ( πνευματικός ) and carnal ( σαρκεϊκός ) or the references to the Logos. We also cannot entirely ignore Hippolytus' judgement that the Naassenes have taken over pagan theories about the undiscoverable and incorruptible generation of man and have applied them to Christ.<sup>128</sup>

Thus we certainly cannot remove the Old Testament and probably not the New Testament elements in the Naassene Preaching, or in their scheme generally. If we do detect behind the elaborate interpretations of the Attis hymn, Homer and the Old and New Testaments

in our present text the pattern of (1) heavenly uncharacterized and totally transcendent Adamas,<sup>129</sup> (2) his son, the creator of the universe and Saviour of (3) the inner man or spiritual man, also called Adamas, having fallen down from the heavenly Adamas<sup>130</sup> in whose image he is, and with whom he is consubstantial<sup>131</sup> (a scheme which has parallels in non-Christian texts like *Eugnostos* and the *Poimandres*), we should note the integral part played by Old Testament texts which frequently have some association with generation, rebirth and baptism, or were given a Christological or sacramental interpretation by New Testament and early Church writers.<sup>132</sup> Once more we are moving in the circle of ideas treated by the author of *Hebrews* in his opening chapters: the sonship and creative and saving action of Christ the Son of God and the pioneer of our salvation, made perfect through suffering, assimilated to his brethren in every respect.<sup>133</sup>

If the subjects of the heavenly voice in Irenaeus' account of the Ophites can thus be readily identified and the pattern of the heavenly hierarchy of Man, Son of Man and son of Son of Man paralleled in other Christianized and non-Christian Gnostic works, is the situation similar in the case of the other two Gnostic texts which record the existence of Man and the Son of Man, i.e. the *Apocryphon of John* and the *Gospel of the Egyptians*? Certainly in the case of the latter we hear of the birth of the heavenly Adamas, the light,<sup>134</sup> who either is

derived from,<sup>135</sup> or is the First Man,<sup>136</sup> who is responsible for  
 the whole universe,<sup>137</sup> the inconceivable Father who came forth from  
 above to below to eliminate the deficiency.<sup>138</sup> Whether Adamas is  
 himself First Man or his son, once more we find attributed to a heavenly  
 Man figure the roles of creator and saviour who descends. Elsewhere  
 Adainas is described as "the incorruptible Man".<sup>139</sup> Furthermore,  
 this Adamas has a son, the great incorruptible Seth, who was produced  
 to be the father of the immoveable and incorruptible race (i.e. the  
 Gnostics).<sup>140</sup> He is depicted as sowing his seed (σπέρμα), i.e.  
 the immoveable generation, in the created aeon,<sup>141</sup> providing for  
 their protection through heavenly watchers,<sup>142</sup> and passing through  
 three advents (παρουσίαι), involving flood, fire and judgement,<sup>143</sup>  
 to save the erring race through the baptism (βάπτισμα) of a  
 logos-created (λογόγενής) body prepared by the great Seth himself  
 through the virgin.<sup>144</sup> Once more the theme of Man and the Son of  
 Man is seen to be intimately bound up with sacramental and Christological  
 motifs, with the birth or rebirth of the Gnostic through a kind of  
 baptism which is directly associated with the baptism of Jesus, the  
 human vessel created by and entered by the heavenly Saviour. This  
 sacramental and Christological interpretation is explicitly confirmed  
 in the following passage where baptism is clearly represented as a  
 symbol of the heavenly mystery of the regeneration of the Gnostic,  
 his renunciation of the world and its ruler, and where the logos-created

being linked with this baptism is identified as Jesus whom the great Seth (i.e. the Saviour) put on.<sup>145</sup>

Much of this picture is remarkably parallel to the Ophite conception of the role of Christ and his relation to Jesus. Thus Sophia Prunicus, who had kept the visible world and its rulers informed of the existence of the incorruptible light, the First Man and the descent of Christ through the prophets,<sup>146</sup> has Jesus emitted by Ialdabaoth from the Virgin Mary, as a pure vessel, wiser, purer and more righteous than any other man, his coming being announced by John and a baptism of repentance being also prepared.<sup>147</sup> Christ, united with Sophia, descends on Jesus and thus Jesus Christ is formed.<sup>148</sup> That this descent is linked to the baptism is suggested by the fact that the Ophites claim confirmation of the descent of Christ from the absence of significant activity by Jesus recorded by his disciples prior to his baptism (and posterior to his resurrection); the latter were unaware that Jesus was united to Christ.<sup>149</sup>

The one major difference between the two texts which is immediately evident - apart from the vastly more complex heavenly world depicted by the Gospel of the Egyptians - is its presumed identification of Man and Son of Man with the heavenly Adamas and his son Seth, of which Irenaeus' account bears no trace.<sup>150</sup> However the figure of the heavenly perfect and true Man, Adamas, does appear in Irenaeus' previous chapter on the Barbelognostics. There he is an emanation of



Autogenes and is associated with the First Light.<sup>151</sup> The Apocryphon of John contains a remarkably similar, if not totally parallel account; in it Autogenes, who is identified with the Son, i.e. Christ, rather than distinguished from him as in the Barbelognostic account, is associated indirectly, along with the supreme being, the invisible Spirit, in the appearance from the aeons Prognosis and Nous of the perfect true Man Adamas, the first manifestation, who is set in (or over) the first aeon of the first light (H)armoziel.<sup>152</sup> Unlike the Barbelognostic account which speaks of Man uniting with Gnosis his consort to produce the Tree, also called Gnosis,<sup>153</sup> the Apocryphon proceeds to record how Seth the son of Adamas was set in (or over) the second aeon with the second Light, and then goes on to mention the seed ( σπέρμα ) of Seth.<sup>154</sup>

This raises the question, if in the Gospel of the Egyptians Man and the Son of Man appear to refer to the heavenly Adamas and his son Seth, is this also true of the Apocryphon of John? Since the heavenly voice is immediately followed by the appearance of the First Man in a man-like image or form,<sup>155</sup> the final determination of this question will have to await our treatment of the motif of the heavenly image. At this point we can ask which figures in the Apocryphon up till this passage could be most appropriately designated Man and Son of Man. Janssens argues that Man here is clearly the First Man, the manifestation of Pronoia and consort of Sophia,<sup>156</sup> the image of

Barbelo, the virginal spirit, the threefold male, bisexual,<sup>157</sup> and that his Son is the Autogenes or Monogenes who is also the Saviour.<sup>158</sup> Giversen also makes the identification of Man with Barbelo or Pronoia on the basis of the occurrences of the term Metropator in CG II,<sup>159</sup> and his son with Christ who, as he points out, is called the son of Metropator.<sup>160</sup> Certainly, as Giversen adds, it is constantly these two, the Mother or Barbelo and Christ who aid the spark of light in the ensuing struggle.<sup>161</sup>

As we have seen, Adamas and his son Seth are associated with the first two aeons, and two categories of men or souls are linked with the third and fourth aeons; the seed of Seth, the souls of the holy ones, with the third,<sup>162</sup> the souls which repent eventually with the fourth.<sup>163</sup> The soteriological and eschatological context of this passage is confirmed by the parallels offered in the Gospel of the Egyptians.<sup>164</sup> The latter text plainly depicts Seth as the guardian and Saviour of his seed, descending three times to rescue the saints,<sup>165</sup> whereas in the Apocryphon it appears to be the Autogenes, i.e. Christ, the Son of Barbelo, who has this role.<sup>166</sup> But the two figures are depicted in remarkably similar fashion. Both are associated with the four lights in a saving descent;<sup>167</sup> both appear to be involved in three advents<sup>168</sup> and are directly associated with baptism and the five seals.<sup>169</sup>

All this would suggest that either the Apocryphon has interpreted the titles "Man and Son of Man" to apply to the second and third figures

of the supreme triad, Barbelo and Christ, rather than to the heavenly Adamas and Seth, as in the Gospel of the Egyptians, or conversely that the latter has switched them from Barbelo and Christ to Adamas and Seth.

In attempting to suggest which identification is primary it might be valuable to note that the Gospel of the Egyptians tends to agree with the Barbelognostics of Irenaeus' account against the Apocryphon in not suggesting any link between Man and Son of Man and Barbelo and Christ, and in apparently distinguishing Christ and Autogenes,<sup>170</sup> while the Apocryphon is closer to the Ophites of Irenaeus, if we accept that it equates Man and Son of Man with the second and third members of the supreme triad,<sup>171</sup> in that both identify the Mother (i.e. Barbelo) and Christ as important figures in the process of redemption.<sup>172</sup> This tends to suggest that the two texts, the Apocryphon and the Gospel of the Egyptians, are attempting to accommodate an independent motif, that of heavenly Man and his Son whose existence is proclaimed by a heavenly voice as the initial impulse for the creation of earthly man, to their original conceptions of the heavenly world.<sup>173</sup> These conceptions combine a basically Barbelognostic scheme of a heavenly triad of Father, Mother and Son plus subordinate aeons in syzygies including Logos, Autogenes etc., with a system which gives a major role in creation and salvation to the heavenly true man Adamas and his son Seth.

What we appear to have here are three basic motifs which recur in various guises and combinations in our texts. First there is that of the heavenly bisexual Anthropos, the man of light, and his Son who has creative and redemptive roles, who can himself be styled Anthropos and who descends in disguise to teach about the true Man and to redeem those who possess a divine element which has fallen from the heavenly Anthropos. Such a view we have suggested appears to underlie the accounts of Monoimus and the Naassenes, and can be detected in such systems as that of the Ophites, and texts like the Apocryphon and the Second Logos of the Great Seth. It may be significant that pagan texts like the Poimandres reflect the motif of the heavenly bisexual light — Anthropos, while both Christianized and non-Christian Gnostic texts like Irenaeus I 30, Eugnostos and the Sophia of Jesus Christ, and the Gospel of Philip, develop the motif of the heavenly hierarchy of Man, Son of Man, son of Son of Man, explicitly or implicitly bisexual, and generally associated with light. This might suggest that the myth of the heavenly Anthropos at least, if not of his Son, is of non-Christian origin. But we ought not to overlook the recollections of the opening chapter of Genesis in Greek with its mention of light (Gen. 1: 3), suggesting the concept of light ( φῶς ) — Man ( ἄνθρωπος ), and its account of Ἄνδρῶν καὶ Ὑγῶν created male and female (Gen. 1: 26f.). As Dodd has pointed out, although the myth of the Anthropos of Poimandres is not based on the Old

Testament, but reflects a widely spread myth of the Urmensch,

Adam is probably more directly the ancestor of the Hellenistic

Ἰσθμίου πρὸς than the Iranian Gayomard of the Bousset-Reitzenstein thesis.<sup>174</sup>

The second motif is that of the supreme heavenly triad of Father, Mother and Son, which may reflect early Christian ideas of the Trinity. Thus that Spirit ( □ 17 ) is feminine in Hebrew, would suggest that one of the Trinity was female, and this would fit perfectly with the Gnostic doctrine that derived the original fall from a heavenly female being who proved weak or deficient or ignorant. The thrust of systems like the Apocryphon, as Schenke has demonstrated, was to tone down as far as possible the original almost blasphemous suggestion that the Supreme Mother, Barbelo, was responsible for the original fall and break in the divine world of perfection.<sup>175</sup> Such a triad is found in the Barbelognostics of Irenaeus,<sup>176</sup> the Apocryphon<sup>177</sup> and the Gospel of the Egyptians.<sup>178</sup> In all three the Son is identified with Christ. But although we have indicated possible Christian influences we might again note that the opening verses of Genesis I in Greek could suggest a primal triad of Father, Holy Spirit hovering over the water, and Son, light-Man.

The third motif is that of the heavenly Adamas and his son Seth who are associated with the creation of earthly Adam and his son.

Adamas is the heavenly archetype in whose image earthly Adam was

formed, (a motif we will discuss in detail later), Seth is the father of the elect race, the pneumatics, the perfect immoveable, kingless generation of the Gnostics. As we have seen both possess soteriological and eschatological significance, particularly Seth, in that he is both responsible for and redeemer of his seed, and in that he and his father are associated with the first two heavenly aeons and lights, the two types of souls which are saved being associated with the third and fourth aeons and lights. The Gospel of the Egyptians emphasises the redemptive role of Seth, but both it and the Apocryphon present a similar picture of the position of Adamas and Seth in the heavenly world. The status of these two, who are clearly heavenly figures, may reflect the tendency to elevate earthly Adam and stress his glorious appearance as found in Jewish (and Christian) Pseudepigraphical literature<sup>179</sup> and in rabbinic Haggada.<sup>180</sup> Quispel has pointed to the less well-known motif of the repentance of Adam and his return to Paradise as found in Jewish magic and elsewhere.<sup>181</sup> This motif may have been reworked by Gnostics, but a more likely explanation of heavenly Adam and Seth than either the evidence of Adam's glory prior to the fall or his return to Paradise is the Gnostic tendency to see earthly figures as images and reflections of prior heavenly beings. The basic impetus is the influence of Platonism, but the basic source would appear to be the opening chapters of

Genesis seen through Gnostic (and Platonic) spectacles. Thus it is surely not accidental that so many Gnostic texts, pagan and Christian, identify the heavenly Anthropos of their systems with light, and name him Adam,<sup>182</sup> or that, like Philo and the rabbis, they deduce from Gen. 1: 26f. that Adam is bisexual<sup>183</sup> or even, again in a manner reminiscent of Philo, they distinguish the heavenly Adam from the man whose creation from the earth is recounted in Gen. 2: 7.<sup>184</sup> However, we must note that, unlike the rabbinic Adam and Seth, the Gnostic Adamas and Seth are purely divine beings, and in distinction to the Philonic conception of Gen. 1: 26 as either referring to the Platonic idea of Man, or as a Platonizing of the rabbinic interpretation of the verse, referring to the genus man,<sup>185</sup> in contrast to the earthly individual man of Gen. 2: 7, the Gnostic texts do not separate the two verses, but apply them both to the man made by the Demiurge and the archons in the image of the heavenly Adamas. And while Philo may be taken to suggest in one passage that the earthly man of Gen. 2: 7 is a likeness of the intelligible man of Gen. 1: 26 who is truly in the image of God,<sup>186</sup> in another he is quick to repudiate the idea that the human body is in any sense like God.<sup>187</sup> But, as we shall see when we come to deal with the motif of the heavenly image, it is precisely this idea which the Gnostics seize on; the earthly Adam is created by the archons imitating the image of the heavenly Man, Adamas, which is reflected in the waters of chaos. As is clear from the



Apocryphon it is no less than the second highest divine being, Barbelo, the First Man, who appears in a man-like form.<sup>188</sup> But certainly if, unlike Philo, the Gnostics clearly distinguish heavenly Adam(as) from the Adam of Gen. 1: 26 (although the former may originally have been derived from the latter), the pattern we find in works like the Apocryphon of supreme Father, Barbelo/First Man as his image, heavenly Adamas and earthly Adam does recall the fourfold scheme Wedderburn detects in Quaest. in Gen. I, 4: God - his Logos - the idea of man - empirical man.<sup>189</sup> That this anthropogenic context of earthly man made in the image of the heavenly helps to explain the existence of Adamas as an independent entity alongside a heavenly Anthropos figure not entirely derivable from Genesis 1 is suggested by the - otherwise mysterious - gloss on Adamas in the Apocryphon as "the first manifestation".<sup>190</sup> This suggests that Barbelo appears to Ialdabaoth and the archons in the form of Adamas; of all the heavenly beings he is the first (and only one) to appear to the subordinate realm of the Demiurge.

This distinction between Barbelo as First Man and Adamas is also perhaps borne out by the fact that the Untitled Treatise charts the appearance to Ialdabaoth of two distinct beings, first Pistis,<sup>191</sup> then light-Adam.<sup>192</sup> However some texts, such as Euginostos and the Sophia of Jesus Christ, appear to identify the heavenly bisexual immortal Man with the heavenly light-Adam.<sup>193</sup> Other systems again,

such as that of the Ophites, make no mention of heavenly Adam and confine themselves to the pattern of Man, Son of Man and son of Son of Man with their various female consorts. Valentinus appears to have incorporated the heavenly Adam into his system, identifying him with the figure of the pre-existent Anthropos; earthly man is fashioned in the name of Anthropos (i.e. Adam) by the angels.<sup>194</sup> However his follower Ptolemaeus and his disciples merely enumerate the aeon Anthropos with his female syzygy Church among the supreme heavenly Ogdoad and make no explicit link between him and earthly Adam,<sup>195</sup> although one of the premises of their system is the concept borrowed from Platonism that the Demiurge creates the visible universe according to the divine archetype; that visible objects are copies of divine ideas. But the Ptolemeans of Irenaeus' account give this concept a characteristic twist: the Demiurge created heaven, earth and man in ignorance of the ideas ( *ἰδέαι* ) of what he was making, his mother Sophia Achamoth being the real source of creation, working through him.<sup>196</sup> This analysis tends to confirm the previous suggestion that the various systems employ various combinations of the three motifs isolated above: (1) that of the heavenly Anthropos and/or his Son with their creative and soteriological roles; (2) that of the supreme heavenly triad of Father, Mother, Son in which Mother and Son have central roles in creation and salvation; and (3) that of the heavenly Adamas and his son Seth, again with anthropogonic and

soteriological roles. The ambiguities and confusions present in our texts appear to arise from attempts to equate the various figures from these independent motifs with one another. Adamas can appear as the Son of heavenly Man (as in the Gospel of the Egyptians),<sup>197</sup> or as both Man and Son of Man (as in the Naassene system),<sup>198</sup> as heavenly Man himself (as in Eucnostos and the Sophia),<sup>199</sup> or as entirely distinct from heavenly Man and his Son (as in the Apocryphon).<sup>200</sup> Texts which appear to make no mention of heavenly Adamas (and Seth) such as the Ophite system, the Ptolemaean school of Valentinianism and the Poimandres do make considerable use of motifs (1) and (2).<sup>201</sup>

Secondly, and related to the last point, one cannot fail to notice how closely the figure of light-Adam is linked to the motif of the heavenly image seen by the archons, or at least how often it occurs in texts which contain the motif (e.g. Apocryphon, Gospel of the Egyptians, Untitled Treatise) in contrast to systems like those of the Ophites or Ptolemaeans which do not make use of the motif, or at least not in a literal fashion. Thus according to the Ophites Sophia supplies the six powers with a mental conception (excogitatio) of man,<sup>202</sup> while in the Ptolemaean system the Demiurge creates man, ignorant of his ideal form (  $\text{ἰδῆναι}$  ), his mother Sophia Achamoth being the true cause of creation.<sup>203</sup> These two systems also agree in interpreting Gen. 1: 26f. to mean that earthly man was created in the image of the Demiurge.<sup>204</sup> The theological tendency of these two

systems, to stress the role of the lower Sophia and emphasize the ignorance of the Demiurge but also the fact that he is responsible for transmitting the divine spark or seed, would explain why they reinterpret the image motif. Earthly man made in the divine image is no longer a bait to lure down the light since it is already present in the Demiurge and his archons; he is not hostile but merely ignorant of the heavenly world, the unwitting tool of his mother. Thus these systems have no need for the heavenly light-Adam and his appearance to the archons.<sup>205</sup>

We have attempted to demonstrate the background to the figures of Man and Son of Man referred to by the heavenly voice in several Gnostic texts and to investigate their identity with reference to various heavenly beings such as the figures of bisexual Anthropos, Adamas, Seth and Christ, and have noted the frequent associations of Man and Son of Man with creation, the origin of earthly man and the sacramental concepts of baptism and regeneration. But we have still to deal with the question of the original form of the heavenly voice. Did the original form refer to both Man and Son of Man, as in Irenaeus' account of the Ophites, the Apocryphon and the Gospel of the Egyptians, or merely to Man as in the Untitled Treatise? Certainly there is no reference to a Son of Man in other anthropogonic texts like the Poimandres, the Hypostasis of the Archons or the Apocalypse of Adam,<sup>206</sup> but it is important to note that both the Hypostasis and the Untitled Treatise

are concerned with the coming of the true immortal Man as an eschatological and soteriological phenomenon,<sup>207</sup> which recalls the role of Seth in the Gospel of the Egyptians<sup>208</sup> or the Saviour Christ in the long version of the Apocryphon<sup>209</sup> and in the Sophia of Jesus Christ,<sup>210</sup> or even the narrator of the Poimandres.<sup>211</sup>

This immortal Man is clearly the eschatological Redeemer and should be distinguished both from the pneumatic Light-Adam of the Untitled Treatise, whose function is anthropogonic and whose involvement in deficiency<sup>212</sup> would rule him out as a perfect Saviour, and from the immortal Man of the Sophia whose liberation from the robbers by the Saviour<sup>213</sup> marks him down as the salvandus. The ambiguity of the figures described as "Man" in the various Gnostic systems is further testimony to the theme of the consubstantiality of salvator and salvandus and to the interrelation of theology, anthropology and soteriology in Gnostic thought. Even Valentinianism, the least mythological and most sophisticated of Gnostic systems, attests the existence of Man as either one of the original aeons or even as Supreme Father,<sup>214</sup> the Saviour, Christ, as Son of Man,<sup>215</sup> and the spiritual Man present in the Gnostics.<sup>216</sup>

Thus although in the Untitled Treatise the voice from heaven makes no mention of the Son of Man, it and other texts which also omit the title do have a figure who corresponds to him and carries out the revelatory and soteriological roles assigned to him in other texts.

Indeed the words of Pistis to Ialdabaoth about the immortal light Man appearing in the future in Ialdabaoth's creatures ( πλάσμις ), trampling on him like a potter ( κερμαεύς ) and causing him to descend to the abyss and thus eliminate the deficiency,<sup>217</sup> apply more appropriately to the eschatological Redeemer, Christ, or the Son of Man in other texts, than to the anthropogonic figure of Light-Adam. The latter may have revealed himself to Ialdabaoth and Pronoia,<sup>218</sup> but this is a protological occurrence and involves no descent into the man created by Ialdabaoth and his archons in the image of Light-Adam. Certainly the text speaks later of Pistis' plan to let the archons create man in the image of the heavenly Light-Adam as a bait to trap him so that the Man should appear before his image and condemn the archons through their creature,<sup>219</sup> but this does not necessarily indicate Light-Adam, who has already appeared as the archetype of the image, and instead of a heavenly Man descending we hear of salvific entities like the breath from Sophia Zoe,<sup>220</sup> or Sophia Zoe herself as Eve, the Instructor.<sup>221</sup>

In the light of this and of the deliberate ambiguity of the titles "Man" and "Son of Man" and the tendency of groups like the Naassenes to treat the two as applying to a single figure, it might be better to treat the formula of the Ophites, the Apocryphon and the Gospel of the Egyptians: "There is Man and the Son of Man" as original but as open to various interpretations. The earliest we have, that of the

Ophites (discounting the possible dating of the Apocryphon or its Vorlage to the beginning of the second century) does treat the two as separate divine entities.

Finally the frequent Gnostic treatment of the Son of Man as involved both in creation, particularly as it relates to the production or sacramental regeneration of spiritual Man (Eugnostos and Sophia, Gospel of Philip, Monoimus, Naassenes, Heracleon,<sup>222</sup> Ptolemaeans<sup>223</sup> etc.), and in redemption (Ophites, Apocryphon, GrSeth, Gospel of the Egyptians, Sophia, Naassenes, Valentinians etc.) recalls the understanding of the role of the Son of God in Hebrews 1 and 2, and in particular the interpretation of Ps. 8: 5-7 in Heb. 2: 5-10.<sup>224</sup>

Thus not only do we have the Father creating the universe through the Son (1: 2) who is the express image (  $\chi\alpha\rho\alpha\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\rho$  ) of his being (1: 3); begotten as his Son (1: 5) and thus superior to and worshipped by the angels (1: 6); depicted as righteous and anointed (1: 8f.); the original and eternal founder of the world (1: 10-12); with his enemies set under his feet (1: 13); but the Son is identified as Man and Son of Man, subordinated for a while to the angels, but glorified, having everything under his feet (2: 5-8), the pioneer of our salvation (2: 10). We have already drawn attention to some of the parallels to these conceptions in the Gnostic texts, but further associations spring to mind particularly as regards the idea, echoed twice in Hebrews, of the Son's enemies being put under his feet (1: 13: a



quotation from Ps. 110(109): 1 and 2: 8: a quotation from Ps. 8: 7). Several Gnostic texts contain the motif of the true man and his elect, the Gnostics, trampling on the Demiurge and his powers at the final consummation,<sup>225</sup> or of the Son of God showing his followers how to trample on death as a sign of ultimate victory over it.<sup>226</sup> Indeed the Untitled Treatise has Sophia in her reproof to Ialdabaoth predict the trampling of the latter by the heavenly Man after his appearance in a creaturely form. Such striking resemblances to Ps. 8: 5-7 do suggest that it may well have formed the basis of the Gnostic mythologoumenon of the heavenly voice proclaiming the prior existence of Man and the Son of Man.

It is worth noting in this connection that Ps. 8: 5 also played an important part in rabbinic interpretation of the creation of man, both in talmudic and midrashic literature. In a passage from the tractate Sanhedrin in the Babylonian Talmud<sup>227</sup> Rabbi Judah (†299) said in Rab's (†247) name with regard to Gen. 1: 26 that when God wanted to create man he said to his angels: "Is it your desire that we make a man in our image?" They, when they heard what his deeds would be like, exclaimed: "what is man that thou art mindful of him and the son of man that thou thinkest of him?" (Ps. 8: 5). As a consequence God destroyed in the fire those companies who resisted him until the angels finally yielded. The same story is told with reference to the ascent of Moses (Exod. 19: 3ff.; 24: 12ff.),<sup>228</sup> and the wisdom of Solomon

with relation to that of Adam (I Kings 5: 11).<sup>229</sup> The Midrash Rabbah on Genesis 1: 26<sup>230</sup> and the Midrash on Psalms 8: 2<sup>231</sup> attest the same tradition of angelic remonstrance, the latter ascribing to the Rab of the Sanhedrin passage the statement that this happened on three occasions, the creation of man (i.e. Gen. 1: 26), the giving of Torah (i.e. Exod. 19: 3ff., 24: 12ff.) and the building of the Tabernacle (i.e. I Kings 5: 11ff.).

This piece of rabbinic haggadah must be seen in the light of speculation about the plural "let us make" of Gen. 1: 26 which suggested that the angels shared in or were solely responsible for the creation of man, a view found in Jewish heretical circles,<sup>232</sup> and also, of course, in Gnosticism.<sup>233</sup> Thus the passage from Sanhedrin cited above both makes it clear that the ministering angels were created on the second day and are thus not coeternal with God, and demonstrates their opposition to the creation of man rather than participation in it, by putting Ps. 8: 5 into their mouths.

Now we find an echo of the angelic question put in the mouth of the Cosmocrator after the apparent crucifixion of Christ in the Second Logos of the Great Seth, in reaction to Christ's mockery at his boast to be the only God. "Who (or What - NIM) is the man?" he asks, and the whole host of angels, thinking that their creation, Adam, is meant, laugh at his puny size, failing to perceive the true heavenly Man above.<sup>234</sup> There is a similar passage in the Apocalypse of Adam which retails

how the God of the powers, alarmed at the mighty signs and wonders done by the Illuminator, will ask: "what is the power of this man who is higher than us?" In consequence he and his powers, filled with wrath at that man, will punish the flesh of the man on whom the Holy Spirit comes, questioning the source of his deceitful name and lying words.<sup>235</sup>

It would seem best to interpret both passages Christologically, the former concerned with the passion of Christ, the latter with the coming of John the Baptist the Illuminator, sealing (or baptising?) men in the name of Seth, proclaiming the coming one (i.e. Seth/Christ) who was greater than he, and the appearance of Christ in various bodily guises leading up to John the Baptist's own suffering and death, or more likely, that of Christ.<sup>236</sup> As we noted above, precisely the same constellation of ideas occurs in the first two chapters of Hebrews: the divine origin of the Son, his superiority to the angels, God's attestation of him through "signs and wonders" (Heb. 2: 4), and his role as the fulfilment of Ps. 8: 5-7 involving his temporary subordination to angels and final glorification. Furthermore both Hebrews and the passage from the Apocalypse of Adam recall details of the baptism of Jesus such as the descent of the Spirit<sup>237</sup> and the heavenly voice acknowledging Christ as God's son.<sup>238</sup> Now awareness of some such voice or claim must be presupposed to make sense of the questions of the God of the Powers in the Second Logos of the Great Seth and the

Apocalypse, i.e. precisely the assertion from heaven of the existence of Man and the Son of Man which we find in the context of the creation of earthly man in the Ophites, the Apocryphon and the Gospel of the Egyptians.

Thus the heavenly voice motif can be seen to underlie and unite the creation of earthly man with the appearance in earthly form of the heavenly true Man, the Redeemer (i.e. the descent of Christ or the Spirit on Jesus at his baptism by John) and his supposed death on the cross. At all three points we have the alarmed reaction of the Demiurge and his angels, issuing in a question asking who or what this Man is in the case of the baptism (ApocAd.) and the passion (GrSeth). May it not therefore be argued that the first occasion of the heavenly voice in our Gnostic dramas, preceding and initiating the creation of earthly man, has arisen from this constellation of ideas linking the Man and Son of Man of Ps. 8: 5ff., as interpreted by Hebrews, with the baptism of Christ and the voice from heaven recognising Christ's divine sonship? As I have already indicated, such a connection seems to underlie the Untitled Treatise's version of the heavenly voice. Furthermore, the almost invariable form of the reproof "There is Man and the Son of Man" suggesting the Greek ἔστιν ἀνθρώπος ... καὶ ὁ υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου might suggest that this statement is constructed on the basis of Ps. 8: 5 LXX. One final, but much more precarious, hypothesis, might be to ask whether this statement was not to some extent influenced by the

rabbinic use of Ps. 8: 5 illustrated above. Thus rather than an angelic remonstrance with God the Gnostics would see this as a genuine response to the prior statement from heaven (which they deduced from the question "what is Man ....?"); "Man exists and the Son of man". It might be objected that no Gnostic text contains this angelic question at the point of man's creation, but (1) I have attempted to show that it does occur in the context of Christ's baptism and passion and that all three themes are interconnected, and (2) the question is made redundant in that it is already present in the form of the heavenly reproof.<sup>239</sup>

Whatever the force of this last argument, it is worth observing that the rabbis make frequent use of the concept of the bath gol, the voice from heaven,<sup>240</sup> and that it also occurs in Gnostic texts like the Baruch of Justin<sup>241</sup> in addition to its use in relation to the creation of the world and of man which we have already examined in the Apocryphon, the Gospel of the Egyptians, the Hypostasis of the Archons and the Untitled Treatise. Significantly perhaps, in all the Gnostic texts cited it is used to correct the erroneous assumption or blasphemous claim of a subordinate heavenly being, usually the Demiurge.

Our conclusions as regards the motif of the heavenly voice would therefore be firstly that Borsch was correct in arguing that the version which includes the Son of Man is the primary one. We have attempted

to give Borsch's argument solid foundation in demonstrating the integral part the Son of Man plays in creation and salvation in so many Gnostic texts, and in showing that it is this figure to whom the Untitled Treatise is referring in its version of the heavenly voice. Secondly we have noted how both the figures of Man and Son of Man are intimately bound up with the themes of man's creation, his spiritual regeneration by sacramental means, particularly baptism, through the secret descent of the Saviour, true Man or Son of Man, and his supposed suffering. Thirdly we noted how the motif of Man and Son of Man has been combined in various ways with other related Gnostic mythologoumena such as the heavenly triad, Father, Mother and Son, and the figures of heavenly Adamas and Seth, but that each has an independent existence. Finally, as regards the origin of Man and the Son of Man, we noted the fact that the role of these figures, and particularly that of the Son, cannot be explained solely in terms of Christian usage, e.g. the Synoptic Son of Man as a basically eschatological phenomenon.

Even if we have no evidence to support Borsch's argument for Jewish sectarian development of the theme of the figure of Man, Son of Man,<sup>242</sup> we cannot fail to notice the striking parallels between the understanding of the creative and saving role of the Son of God in Hebrews, developed in terms of Psalms 2, 45, 102, 110 and 8, and that of the Son of Man or the Saviour or Christ in Gnostic texts, in which Ps. 8: 5-7 in particular seems to play an important part. Both

orthodox Christians and Gnostics appear to be drawing on the same pool of ideas and interpretations of Old Testament texts. Both find the figure of heavenly Christ, the Saviour, God's Son and his agent of creation, revelation and judgment, his coming incognito, and his suffering (only apparent in the case of the Gnostics) and victory predicted in the Old Testament.

However, while the majority of Gnostic texts which refer to the Son of Man are Christianized and identify the Son of Man with Christ, some texts, as we have seen, appear to have a triadic structure in which the Saviour is the son of the Son of Man. This occurs in the non-Christian Eugnostos and in the Christian Ophite system (and possibly in the Valentinian Gospel of Philip)<sup>243</sup>. But whereas the Gospel of Philip is ambiguous in its use of Son of Man and son of Son of Man, and the Sophia, following Christian convention equates Christ not with the son of the Son of Man, but with the Son of Man,<sup>244</sup> the Ophites of Irenaeus' account appear to distinguish Christ very clearly from the Son of Man. He is called Son of Man, but specifically as Son of First Man,<sup>245</sup> and it may be that the very tortuous account of his origin from both Man and Son of Man<sup>246</sup> is an attempt to square an original Gnostic conception of the Saviour as the son of the Son of Man with the Christian view of Christ as Son of Man. One wonders if the difficulties the Valentinians have in explaining what is clearly accepted as a traditional Christian title for the Saviour, 'Son of Man',<sup>247</sup> and their



remarkable triple Christ (the heavenly aeon, the Saviour produced by the Pleroma and the man Jesus on whom the Saviour descended)<sup>248</sup> may not also reflect attempts to assimilate a hierarchy of Saviour-figures descending from an original heavenly Man with the Christian view of Christ as Son of Man, the first-born of the whole creation indwelt by the whole fullness ( *πληρώμας* ) of the Godhead (Col. 1: 15-19 etc.).

The view of the Son of Man as interpreted by Hebrews in terms of Ps. 8: 5-7 and given protological as well as eschatological attributes may well have influenced Gnostics in their independent development of the motif of heavenly Man and his Son (and his son?), but Christian influence alone cannot explain all the features of the Gnostic view. However the one underlying feature we have noted in so many texts is the presence of interpretations and mythologoumena drawn from the Old Testament. This does suggest that the version of the heavenly reproof closest to what I have argued is its probable source, Ps. 8: 5, i.e. that of the Apocryphon and the Gospel of the Egyptians, is most likely to have been the primary one which the Ophites of Irenaeus and the author of the Untitled Treatise have expanded or reworked in an attempt to make the original rather enigmatic utterance more comprehensible, assimilate it to the boast of Ialdabaoth and, in the latter case, to predict how the cosmic drama will resolve itself, in terms of the appearance of the true Man and

the condemnation and annihilation of Ialdabaoth.

The appearance of the heavenly image and its consequences

In the short recension of the Apocryphon the heavenly voice alluding to the existence of Man and the Son of Man, which Ialdabaoth ignorantly ascribes to his mother, is followed by the appearance of the holy perfect Father, the First Man, in the form of a man. He reveals his likeness (ΕΙΝΕ) to the seven archons who see the form of the image (Εἰκών) in the water and say to one another: "Let us make a man in the image (Εἰκών) of God and in his likeness (ΕΙΝΕ)".<sup>249</sup> The long recension appears to represent a considerable expansion of this. It records that the holy Metropator (μετροπάτωρ) taught them and the perfect Pronoia, the image (Εἰκών) of the invisible one who is the Father of the All through whom everything came into being, the First Man: he revealed his likeness (ΕΙΝΕ) in a manlike form (ΤΥΠΟΣ ΝΑΝΔΡΕΔΕΔΕC).<sup>250</sup> This evidently represents an attempt by the author(s) of the long recension to make it clear that it is Barbelo, the first emanation and self reflection of the totally inexpressible and transcendent Father and not the latter, as the short recension might be taken to suggest, who is the subject: she appears in a masculine form.

The continuation in the long recension, which records the trembling of the whole aeon of the chief archon, the shaking of the foundations of the abyss, the illumination of the underside of the waters above

matter by the appearance of the image (εἰκών), and the authorities and chief archon seeing the illumination and through it the form (τύπος) of the image (εἰκών) in the water,<sup>251</sup> is best explained as a further example of the sustained effort of the author(s) of the long recension to increase the distance between the Demiurge (and his mother Sophia) and the heavenly world, and emphasise the sublime and spiritual character of the latter.<sup>252</sup> The vivid details are added not merely as the usual accompaniments of such a theophany<sup>253</sup> but precisely to achieve this emphasis and heighten the drama.

However, the long recension with its insistence on the character of the manlike image as light does highlight a point which the short recension only suggests later when it has the archons say: "Let us call him (their creation) 'Adam', that his name and power may become light for us."<sup>254</sup> We have already alluded to the frequency with which the heavenly Adam is associated with light in Gnostic texts and suggested the significance in this regard of Gen. 1: 2 LXX,<sup>255</sup> but what is worth noting here is the emphasis on the appearance of light. In the parallel passage in the Untitled Treatise from Codex II it is the light which first appears and which is seen by all the heavenly powers: the image (εἶμα) of a man is seen only by Ialdabaoth and his Pronoia.<sup>256</sup> Even more significantly, in the Hypostasis of the Archons, the motif of the light being called forth by the taunt of Ialdabaoth is entirely independent of the revelation of a heavenly figure in whose image earthly Adam is

fashioned.<sup>257</sup> That is, the motif of light being reflected in the waters of chaos can, as already suggested,<sup>258</sup> be used in a cosmogonic as well as an anthropogonic context.

In his analysis of the motif of the reflection of the image of heavenly Man in the waters of chaos and the desire produced in Nature to unite with it, in the *Poimandres*,<sup>259</sup> Jonas detects three different ideas adroitly combined, which are germane to our discussion. They are (i) that of the Darkness becoming enamoured of the Light and getting possession of a part of it; (ii) that of the Light becoming enamoured of the Darkness and voluntarily sinking into it and (iii) that of a radiation, reflection or image of the Light projected into the Darkness below and there held fast. Version (i) he finds exemplified in Manicheism, (ii) in a quotation from Macrobius,<sup>260</sup> and (iii) in the Sethians<sup>261</sup> and Peratae<sup>262</sup> of Hippolytus, the Gnostics Plotinus wrote against,<sup>263</sup> and in the "barbarian" system recorded by Basilides.<sup>264</sup> As Jonas points out, the significance of the third version is that it allows the presence of Light in some form in the world of Darkness without having to admit a real descent or fall. Light can either be projected as a ray,<sup>265</sup> or if it issues from a divine figure such as Sophia or Man, can appear as a form projected into the dark medium and appearing there as an image or reflection of the divine.<sup>266</sup> Jonas' analysis thus suggests precisely why the motif can be used both cosmogonically and anthropogonically, and it will be employed and tested in what follows.

The second element we will have to consider in our analysis is the reaction of the archons to the appearance of the heavenly image. The short recension has the archons say to one another: "Let us make a man in the image (εἰκῶν) of God and in the "(BG) or "his (CG III) likeness (εἶνε)"<sup>267</sup> whereas the long recension reads: "He (i.e. Ialdabaoth) said to the powers who were with him, 'Come let us create a man in (κατὰ) the image (εἰκῶν) of God and in (κατὰ) our likeness (εἶνε), that his image (εἰκῶν) be for us a light'".<sup>268</sup> Clearly this is an allusion to Gen. 1: 26 which gives a satisfactory answer in Gnostic terms to the awkward plural of the text - the archons are responsible - and supplies the appropriate scriptural grounding to their view that earthly man is made in the likeness of a divine being, heavenly Man. However, neither reproduces the original (i.e. the LXX version), for the short recension ignores the "our (ἡμετέροισι)", preferring the "in the image of God" of v. 27, and thus interprets the archontic action, for which it supplies no immediate motive,<sup>269</sup> as simply copying the divine image, while the long recension ascribes the address to Ialdabaoth,<sup>270</sup> supplies a motive (getting control of a source of light), and distinguishes between image (εἰκῶν) and likeness (εἶνε = εἰσὶν οἷς).<sup>271</sup> Earthly man is made in the image of God, but also in the likeness of the archons.

The latter conception, which is paralleled in the Untitled Treatise,<sup>272</sup> and Manichaeism,<sup>273</sup> suggests, more or less implicitly, that while

externally the archontic creation looks like its heavenly original, in essence it belongs to its creators. The significance of this is clear in the case of the Untitled Treatise and Hypostasis: the archontic creators hope the earthly copy will cause its heavenly archetype to fall in love with it and thus be neutralised<sup>274</sup> or captured.<sup>275</sup> This implies, as the texts go on to confirm, that the divine element or divine Man is not yet present in the earthly copy. The reverse, of course, is true of the Manichean version: the archons already possess the scattered light elements, and the inconsistency or lack of motive for their creation of man in their own form and according to the heavenly shape suggests that the Manichees have retained the earlier version without attempting to make it fit.

The Apocryphon represents a kind of intermediate stage or compromise: Ialdabaoth possesses the power of light from his mother, but did not communicate any of it to his offspring,<sup>276</sup> while they alone are responsible for creating earthly (or psychic) man, who, although made in the divine image, remains immobile until Ialdabaoth is prevailed upon to inbreathe something of his power of light.<sup>277</sup> Here we have a two-stage process in the formation of and animation of earthly Adam which seems to rely on Gen. 1: 26 and 2: 7, and thus the second question in our analysis will be to ask what role these texts play in Gnostic anthropogony, and examine the validity of Schenke's thesis that the figure of the God "Man" grew out of Gnostic speculation

upon Gen. 1: 26f.<sup>278</sup> Certainly the short recension of the Apocryphon, which has the archons see the reflection of the divine Man in the waters of chaos, utter the words of Gen. 1: 26 without addition and create earthly man in the divine likeness, is closest to the account Irenaeus gives us of Saturninus' views.<sup>279</sup> The latter gives no independent role to the God of the Jews (with whom Ialdabaoth is equated in other systems) in the creation of man and has no apparent trace of Gen. 2: 7, but does contain the third element in our analysis of the motif of the heavenly image and the archontic response: the creation of earthly man as a crawling or immobile Golem and his consequent animation.<sup>280</sup>

Let us first, therefore, examine the cosmogonic use of the image—reflection motif to see if it can throw any light on the origins of its anthropogonic use which is our main concern. We have already suggested that the motif in the texts we examined was most at home in an anthropogonic context.<sup>281</sup> The account by Basilides of the ideas of certain "barbarians" (Persians?)<sup>282</sup> offers a convenient starting point. These barbarians, who are evidently not Christian, posited two unoriginate principles, light and darkness, which co-existed in blissful ignorance until each came to recognise the other and darkness contemplated the light, conceiving a desire (concupiscentia) for the better object and longing to mingle with it. The light, however, was not affected by the darkness and simply wanted to gaze (spectandi libido) and did so as if through a mirror. Thus only a reflection



(enfasin) of the light reached the darkness: the light itself drew back,<sup>283</sup> but the darkness had acquired the reflection or lustre whereby it was made aware of its repulsiveness, but also whereby it (creatura: what was created) was able to produce something similar (to what it had seen?), i.e. the visible creation. Points to note here are the motif of desire or longing (an echo of Jonas' ideas (i) and (ii)?), the denial that light was contaminated combined with the admission that some part of the light was indeed detained in matter (Jonas' idea (iii)), and the suggestion that this visible world is a copy of the heavenly world.<sup>284</sup> Similar ideas recur in Plotinus' account of the Gnostics - again apparently non-Christian - whom he knew.<sup>285</sup> They spoke at one point, he says, of the soul or a certain Sophia descending, of whom the individual souls form a part, but at another deny that she descended insisting that she merely illuminated the darkness, causing an image (εἰδωλον) to come into being in matter. This image causes another to originate out of matter, this latter being called the Demiurge who creates the cosmos right down to the last image (εἰδωλον). Once more the reflection motif makes possible the paradox demanded by the Gnostic position, that the divine is somehow present in man, yet has not fallen, and also suggests the idea of this world as an image of the heavenly realm.

Hippolytus' account of the doctrines of the Sethians which he appears to derive from a "Paraphrase of Seth" also suggests elements

of the image-reflection motif being introduced to explain the origin of the cosmos. The Sethians, he states, have three essential principles: light, darkness and between them pure spirit.<sup>286</sup> Light and spirit are somehow drawn down and transferred into the dreadful water of the darkness (Jonas' idea (ii)?) which, in its turn, wants to retain possession of the brilliance and spark of light with the fragrance of spirit,<sup>287</sup> while they seek to recover their own powers which were mingled with the dark water.<sup>288</sup> From the impacts of the infinite powers of the three principles, galvanised by the approach to one another of unlike entities, come stamps or images which are the "ideas" of various creatures.<sup>289</sup> A similar, if more mythological, picture seems to underlie the Paraphrase of Shem (or Sēm;  $\text{C}\eta\epsilon\text{M}$ ) of Codex VII, which appears to be related to the Paraphrase of Seth.<sup>290</sup> Here there is no explicit image motif but we do find present the idea of the light shining down on the watery darkness and being attracted down into it, and of the darkness seeking to possess the light to have the spark at its service and thus be able to see.<sup>291</sup> Here light appears to initiate the descent (Jonas' idea (ii)?) while darkness craves to retain possession of the spark of light (a trace of Jonas' idea (i)?). In the fact that it appears to be not light itself but rather its brilliance or a spark which is trapped in matter, we may have Jonas' third idea present.

Finally, there appear to be traces of the cosmogonic use of the

motif in the Hypostasis of the Archons.<sup>292</sup> The boast of Ialdabaoth that he alone exists provokes the heavenly retort that he is wrong. Thus challenged, he replies: "If there is another before me, well then let him appear to me". Sophia puts light into matter and follows it down, withdrawing immediately. This version appears to correspond to Jonas' first idea according to which Darkness takes the initiative. However, the Hypostasis makes amends for this in its anthropogony since it has a heavenly being appear to unite the All with the Light.<sup>293</sup>

To turn now to the anthropogonic use of the image-reflection motif, the simplest version appears to be that of Saturninus.<sup>294</sup> This relates how the world and man were created by seven angels. A shining image (φαινή εἰκών: lucida imago) appears from above (ἀνωθεν : desursum) from the supreme power (ἀνθεντία : summa potestas)<sup>295</sup> which the seven are unable to retain (κρατεῖν : tenere) since it immediately withdraws above (ἀνωθεν : sursum). They therefore encourage one another saying: "Let us make man in image and likeness (κατ'εἰκὸν καὶ κατ'ὁμοίωσιν : ad imaginem et similitudinem)". When created man cannot be raised erect because of the powerlessness of the angels but wriggles like a worm, the power above taking pity on him because he is made in its likeness (ὁμοίωμα : similitudo) sends down a spark (σπινθήρ : scintilla) of life which raises the man, equips him with limbs and makes him live. This spark of life hastens

back to its own kind after death. This account is paralleled more or less closely by Pseudo-Tertullian,<sup>296</sup> Filastrius,<sup>297</sup> Epiphanius<sup>298</sup> and Theodoret.<sup>299</sup> Filastrius and Epiphanius however, unlike the other accounts, do mention and emphasise the element of desire: the angels are filled with desire (concupiscentia:  $\pi\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\varsigma$ ) for the light; desirous (cupidi) of that light they longed to see its power.<sup>300</sup> Epiphanius, as we might expect, lays even greater stress upon this aspect: the angels experienced sexual excitement ( $\epsilon\rho\epsilon\theta\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}\varsigma$ ) and desire ( $\pi\acute{o}\theta\epsilon\varsigma$ ) for the likeness ( $\delta\mu\omega\iota\omega\mu\alpha$ ) above. They were overcome with pleasure ( $\epsilon\delta\omicron\nu\eta$ ) and love ( $\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\theta\alpha\iota$ ), unable to satiate their infatuation ( $\epsilon\rho\alpha\varsigma\mu\acute{o}\tau\eta\varsigma$ ).<sup>301</sup> Filastrius also adds "our" (nostram) to "likeness", which destroys the point of the motif, that the earthly man should be in the likeness of the heavenly light being. This suggests a mistake on his part, prompted perhaps by his knowledge of the biblical text.

Although the texts simply speak of a shining image, the fact that the heavenly power takes pity on man since he is in his likeness suggests that Saturninus envisaged the image as in the form of a man. The picture presented by the heresiologists, although probably merely an incomplete sketch or caricature, depicts the motif at its simplest level. There is no attempt to explain why the light appeared, linking it with a cosmogony as is the case in the Apocryphon; there is no trace of Ialdabaoth; in explanation of the angelic action we only have

the hint (in Filastrius and Epiphanius) of the idea of lust or desire on the part of the angels, and the citation of Gen. 1: 26 is made to fit by being stripped of its original plural possessive pronoun. Finally, there is a version of the Golem motif according to which earthly man cannot be raised up because of the weakness of the angels and can only crawl like a worm until animated and raised up by the spark of life sent down directly from above.

The account of Saturninus' view preserved by the heresiologists does not really correspond to any of the three ideas Jonas detects behind the Poimandres which he claims various groups used to explain the presence of light in darkness. Light here takes the initiative, as in idea (ii), but only an image is seen and actually descends - as in idea (iii). However, contrary to that idea, it is not trapped by the archons, but immediately reascends. There is no allusion to a reflection being seen in the waters of chaos which we might have expected if Gen. 1 were the basic underlying source, and although man's creation is in two stages, there is no reference to Gen. 2: 7 as indicating the animation of the helpless Golem, Adam, which again we might have expected if Gen. 1 and 2 were the source, and which we do get in the Apocryphon. Despite Jervell's arguments,<sup>302</sup> there is no indication that the spark of life is to be equated with the inner man, or Anthropos, thought of as the supreme God himself. The heresiological accounts seem to be unaware that it is heavenly

Man who appears here, a fact one has to deduce from the indication that the heavenly power felt compassion towards the Golem because he was in its (the power's) likeness, and the image motif functions only as an archontic caricature. Earthly man does not possess the divine spark in that he is in the image; as such he is an inanimate Golem. He possesses it only as a gift, not through the divine being deceived by the likeness, but through the divine having compassion on it.

If, as Rudolph suggests, Saturninus' view (along with the Naassene version) represents the simplest scheme and possibly the oldest type of the Gnostic Primal Man myth,<sup>303</sup> we should note the parallels with the cosmogonic version of Basilides' "barbarians" (Light being seen by Darkness, Darkness' desire for it, a reflection descending and earthly creation being thereby made in the image of the heavenly). In comparison the parallels with Gen. 1 (the appearance of Light, the version of Gen. 1: 26) appear less comprehensive than one would expect, suggesting that it is being used more as illustration than as original source, or at least that an existing motif is being read back into it.

One of the closest parallels to Saturninus' scheme is offered by the Hypostasis of the Archons.<sup>304</sup> It records how a female heavenly being (ΔΤΜΝΤ ΔΤΤΕΚΘ i.e. Ἀφθαρσία ?)<sup>305</sup> looked down to the regions of the waters (of chaos?). Her image (εἰκὼν) appeared in

the waters and the powers of darkness fell in love with it. But they were unable to reach that image (εἰνέ) which had appeared to them because of their weakness. This is glossed: "for the psychics (ψυχικὸς) will not be able to reach the pneumatic (πνευματικός), because they are from below but he is from above".<sup>306</sup> The reason for this event is then given: it is part of the plan of the supreme Father to unite the All (the universe? the pneumatics?) with the Light. The (seven?)<sup>307</sup> archons hold a council and say "Come, let us make a man of dust (χόος) from the earth (a combination of Gen. 1: 26 and 2: 7)". Man is formed (πλασθεῖν) from dust from the earth according to (κατὰ) the body (εἰμα) of the archons and [according to (κατὰ ?) the image (εἰνέ ?)] of God which appeared (to them) in the waters. Their motive is then made explicit: it is to trap the heavenly image reflected in the waters in their moulded form (πλασμά), the co-image or male counterpart, which is thus to act as a visual lure.<sup>308</sup>

The continuation of the text (after further stress on the impotence of the archons): "And he breathed into his face, and man became psychic (ψυχικός) upon the earth for many days,"<sup>309</sup> is evidently a reference to the activity of the Demiurge modelled on Gen. 2: 7. No reason is given for this and despite it, in contrast to the version in the Apocryphon, Adam still remains a Golem, whom the powers cannot raise because of their weakness.<sup>310</sup> Despite the archons' whirlwind



efforts to capture the image (εἰς) they fail through ignorance of the nature of its power. This is all part of the Father's plan. And it is only after the Spirit sees the psychic man on the earth, comes forth from the adamantine (ἀδύμαντις) earth (or land), descends, and settles in him that man becomes a living soul (ψυχὴ cf. Gen. 2: 7) and is named Adam since he was found moving upon the ground.<sup>311</sup>

Here the creation and animation of Adam takes place in three stages. He is moulded by the archons from earth as a choic being in their image and in the likeness of the divine being who appeared to them, to trap the divine being. This represents a conflation of elements from Gen. 1: 26f. and 2: 7 in addition to the image-reflection motif which betrays further evidence of influence from Gen. 1 (the reflection in the waters of chaos). The implication is that man is incomplete and merely choic. Hence Gen. 2: 7 is employed to suggest the second stage: man becomes psychic through the inbreathing of the Demiurge.<sup>312</sup> But for the Gnostics not even the soul or psychic element was the truly divine element: it still remained the handiwork of a subordinate deity, the ignorant and arrogant Ialdabaoth. The truly divine element was the spirit sent down from heaven as a gift. It alone can give man life.

Once more we meet here the image-reflection motif, but in a form not corresponding to any single one of Jonas' three versions. The archons fall in love with the image (idea (i)) but cannot capture it,

and their attempt to lure it down (an echo of idea (ii)?) fails. It is not the image itself which descends, but only a reflection (idea (iii)). But the divine element which eventually comes down is the Spirit, and there is no hint that the resemblance is what attracts it, nor is the theme of compassion, found in Saturninus' version, present. The new element, compared with Saturninus' version, is the introduction of Gen. 2: 7 into the motif and with it a three-fold cosmological and anthropological<sup>10</sup> scheme. The Demiurge is given an independent role as the subject of Gen. 2: 7, responsible for the psychic nature of, or psychic element in, man, while the seven archons, his offspring, are the subject of Gen. 1: 26 and responsible for the material or choic element in man. But the transition from a two-fold to a three-fold scheme is not complete. The psychic element and its representatives, the Demiurge and the archons, are still depicted as hostile and the Demiurge's inbreathing seems to make no difference. The psychic has as yet no intermediate role. Choic and psychic man remains a creeping Golem, until the Spirit descends from above,<sup>313</sup> Besides the scriptural sources, Böhlig<sup>314</sup> and Bullard<sup>315</sup> draw attention to Jewish parallels and Jewish influence, particularly with regard to the etymology of Adam.

As with Saturninus' version the precise identity of the heavenly being who appears is not made clear but only obliquely hinted at. The Spirit's descent from the Adamantine land and Ialdabaoth's later

demand that the pre-existing Light (Man?) appear<sup>316</sup> might suggest that our text presupposes the figure of heavenly light Man or Adam. Certainly, he appears in the Apocryphon and plays a prominent part in the Untitled Treatise (which runs closely parallel to the Hypostasis at many points). In contrast to Saturninus the Hypostasis offers a reason for the course of events, i.e. the divine plan of salvation, and allows Gen. 1 and 2 to play a much greater role, particularly in its development of a three-fold rather than a two-fold cosmological and anthropological scheme.

If we now turn to the Untitled Treatise we discover a rather more complicated picture. Not one but at least two heavenly figures appear to the Demiurge, Ialdabaoth, and are reflected in the waters of chaos: first Sophia, then Light-Adam. Sophia reveals the likeness (εἰκὼν) of her greatness in the waters then withdraws again after rebuking Ialdabaoth for his arrogant boast and affirming the existence of a heavenly Man of light.<sup>317</sup> Ialdabaoth's obedient son, Sabaoth, is given light by Sophia and set over his father and fellow archons as a kind of judgment: he is depicted in terms of the God of Ezekiel's vision and creates in imitation of the heavenly world.<sup>318</sup> His father, grieved on seeing the likeness of Pistis in the waters, and disturbed by the revelation that an immortal Man of light existed before him, demands that if such a being exists he should appear and reveal his light. At once a light issues from the eighth (heaven?) and passes

through all the earthly heavens, causing the Demiurge shame and amazement. In this light there appears to him and his Pronoia a human image (  $\epsilon\iota\kappa\epsilon$  ), but the light is all that his powers see. <sup>319</sup>

The Pronoia falls in love with the angelic figure, but he hates her since she is in the darkness. Because she cannot achieve her desire to embrace him she sheds the reflection of the light she has received (Jonas' idea (iii)) on the earth, which embraces it. <sup>320</sup>

At this point we meet a play on the title Adam and its meanings in Hebrew and Greek (  $\alpha\delta\alpha\mu$ ,  $\alpha\delta\alpha\mu$ ,  $\alpha\delta\alpha\mu$ ,  $\alpha\delta\alpha\mu$  ), <sup>321</sup> which leads to the conclusion that the earth was purified by the likeness of Pistis Sophia appearing to the Archigenetor in the waters. <sup>322</sup> The resulting androgyne, Eros, is responsible for plant life in the cosmos including the trees of Paradise. <sup>323</sup>

With the formation and ordering of heaven complete, Light-Adam desires to re-enter his light in the Ogdoad, but he is unable to since his light has somehow become mingled with deficiency (or poverty). <sup>324</sup> This causes him to construct an intermediate aeon, with its aeons and worlds, in the infinite zone between the Ogdoad and the world of chaos, <sup>325</sup> and this delay enables the powers to spy on him and mock the Archigenetor for his arrogant boast, asking him if this is the god who destroyed their work. <sup>326</sup> Ialdabaoth. seizes on this point. To avoid this, he says: "Come, let us create a man from the earth in (  $\kappa\epsilon\tau\epsilon$  ) the image (  $\epsilon\iota\kappa\epsilon$  ) of our body and in (  $\kappa\epsilon\tau\epsilon$  ) the likeness (  $\epsilon\iota\kappa\epsilon$  )

of that one (conflation of Gen. 1: 26 and 2: 7) in order that he may serve us so that whenever that one sees his likeness (εἶναι) he will fall in love with it. Then he will no longer destroy our work, but we shall make those who will be begotten from the light servants to ourselves through all the time of this aeon".<sup>327</sup> But, as in the Hypostasis, our author is quick to insist that this is all part of the foresight (πρόνοια) of Pistis that man should appear face to face with his likeness (εἶναι) and condemn them from within their moulded body (πλασμός). This was to become a hedge or screen for the light.<sup>328</sup>

There then follows<sup>329</sup> the account of the creation by Sophia Zoe, an offspring of Pistis associated with Sabaoth, of the Instructor, the androgynous figure of Hermaphrodite, who is later to be identified as the psychic Adam revealed on the fourth day.<sup>330</sup> That such knowledge was revealed by Sabaoth and his Christ to the souls which were to be imprisoned in the moulded bodies of the powers, suggests that we are dealing here with the intermediate level of creation and salvation represented in Valentinianism by the psychic Demiurge and his Christ.

This brings us at length to the formation (πλασμός) by the seven archons of man so that his body resembled their body and his likeness (εἶναι) that of Light-Adam, each contributing a portion, the chief archon being responsible for the brain and marrow. Thus man appeared like (ὡς) the one before him, became a psychic (ψυχικός) man named

Adam according to the name of the one before him.<sup>331</sup> But although classed as a psychic, man was still without soul and was left an abortion by the Demiurge for forty days<sup>332</sup> until Sophia Zoe sent her breath into the soulless Adam, the immobile Golem, causing him to move on the earth. But although he could move and speak, he still could not stand upright.<sup>333</sup> Finally, after the archons had heard his assertion that he had come to ruin their work, praised him nevertheless for giving them rest from their fear and anxiety (!) and, rejoicing at his inability to rise, set him in Paradise, Sophia Zoe sent Eve, her daughter, to awaken Adam who was still without soul. Seeing her co-image she had pity on him and exclaimed, "Adam, live! Rise up on the earth!" This does the trick. Adam stood up and opened his eyes.<sup>334</sup>

Despite the complexity of the various motifs and mythologoumena, the outlines of the image-reflection theme, elements from Gen. 1: 26 and 2: 7 and the idea of Adam as a Golem animated in stages, are clearly visible. The first is duplicated so as to involve both a female (Sophia) and a male (Light-Adam) heavenly being,<sup>335</sup> and to suggest both the integrity of the divine realm and also the necessary paradox that even the descent of a reflection means that light is trapped in matter: even Light-Adam is tainted by deficiency. As with the Hypostasis, elaborate reasons are given for the theophanies (they are to purify the primordial waters and the earth; they are part of the

divine plan to condemn the creations of the arrogant Ialdabaoth and remove the deficiency). However, there is less reliance on the detail of Gen. 1: 26 and 2: 7 than we found in the Hypostasis. There is the motif of the reflection in the waters of chaos, the distinction between image and likeness (also found in the long recension of the Apocryphon), man made from dust, but no mention of the Demiurge breathing the breath of life into Adam. Rather it is Sophia Zoe, the daughter of Pistis, who does this, representing in all probability a reinterpretation of the breath of life (  $\pi\nu\sigma\upsilon\chi\eta$   $\zeta\omega\eta\varsigma$  ) of Gen. 2: 7.

As for Jonas' three ideas, we do find once more the love motif: Pronoia falls in love with Light-Adam (idea (i)), but does not lure him down; the archons create earthly Adam in the likeness of Light-Adam to try to make the latter fall in love with him (idea (i) again?), but also fail. The animation and raising of the Golem who is first immobile (unlike Saturninus and the Hypostasis), then moves and speaks and finally stands up and opens his eyes, is evidently an expansion of a simpler scheme which still betrays certain inconsistencies (Adam is psychic when formed, can move and speak after Sophia Zoe's inbreathing, but still does not have a soul). This may be attributed partly to the attempt by the author to harmonise the animation of the Golem to the awakening of Adam by Eve, partly to the influence of rabbinic motifs concerning the stages of Adam's creation, and partly to the author's evident fondness for multiplying



events and characters. Underlying the narrative is a similar three-fold structure to that of the Hypostasis (and the Apocryphon), of choic, psychic and pneumatic, summarised in the programmatic formula of the Gnostic Octahemeron.<sup>336</sup>

Another text, but this time one entirely uninfluenced by Christianity, in which the image-reflection motif and the figure of heavenly Man play a central role is the Poimandres. Its anthropological section begins with the begetting of androgynous Primal Man (Ἀνδρῶπιος) by the supreme Father, Nous, who is light and life.<sup>337</sup> Man is equal (ἴσος), i.e. consubstantial, with him and loved by him, being extremely beautiful since he reproduces the image (εἰκών) of his Father, for, as the author points out, God can only really love himself.<sup>338</sup> Catching sight of the creation of the Demiurge, also the son of Nous and thus Man's brother, he wanted to create too and descended into the fiery sphere of the Demiurge where the offspring of the latter, the seven Governors (διοικητῆς), fell in love with him, each giving him a share of his position.<sup>339</sup> At this point the seven Governors, who control the planets and their spheres, are not hostile to God, as is customary in other Gnostic systems; they are the creation of his son, working according to his will.<sup>340</sup>

Man wanted to break through the outermost rim of the spheres to recognise the power of his brother, the Demiurge Nous.<sup>341</sup> He did so and revealed to Nature (φύσις) below the beautiful form

(μορφή) of God. Seeing him in his inexhaustible beauty, having the whole power of the Governors and the shape (μορφή) of God, she smiled in love (έρως), inasmuch as she saw the image (εἶδος) of the beautiful form (μορφή) of the Man in the water and his shadow (σκιᾶσμα) on the ground.<sup>342</sup> However, as Haenchen points out, Man does not succumb to this love.<sup>343</sup> Instead the author of the treatise invokes the Narcissus motif to explain how heavenly Man came to be trapped in this world: Man saw his reflection in the water of Nature, fell in love with it,<sup>344</sup> and his desire to inhabit the irrational shape (μορφή) was accomplished instantaneously. Nature embraced him completely and they were united since both were fired by έρως.<sup>345</sup> Thus, of all living things on earth, man alone is two-fold, mortal on account of his body, but immortal on account of the "inner man" (οὐσιώδης ψυχῶπις).<sup>346</sup>

The production of earthly man is then sketched in greater detail in two forms which do not harmonise and clearly represent distinct traditions:<sup>347</sup> (a) Nature (being of earth and water) unites with the Man who possesses the characteristics of the seven (fire and spirit), but being unable to contain the superior elements immediately gives birth to seven men in accordance with (πρός) the natures of the seven, androgynous and upright;<sup>348</sup> (b) the seven men are produced not through the involvement of the seven Governors, as we have just been told, but by seven entities (the four elements, nature, soul

(from life) and mind (from light)), their bodies corresponding to (  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$  ) the image (  $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\delta\epsilon\varsigma$  ) of the Man.<sup>349</sup>

Here we have once more the motif of love or desire in connection with the mythologoumenon of the image (Nature falls in love with the image of Man in the water; Man falls in love with his own reflection; Man and Nature become lovers). But in this case, Man descends because he loves himself, just as the supreme God, Nous, loved his own image and gave him autonomy and authority over all his creation. The use of the Narcissus motif helps to excuse the blasphemy of heavenly Light-Man, in a sense God himself, being trapped in matter and our author neatly combines elements of Jonas' ideas (i), (ii) and (iii). How far Gen. 1 and 2, and 1: 26 and 2: 7 in particular, play any significant role in the anthropogony of Poimandres is a matter of debate.<sup>350</sup> Certainly, Primal Man possesses the  $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\kappa\omega\nu$  of God, and the bodies of the seven first men correspond to his image (  $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\delta\epsilon\varsigma$  ). But Man is begotten, not created, by Nous and possesses his image rather than being made in accordance with it. He is a heavenly being, not the earthly man of Gen. 1: 26 and 2: 7, and we have seven men, not one, brought forth by Nature, not by the seven Governors. At this point they clearly belong to the realm and providence of God and his son the Demiurge (their father), and are not the hostile planetary powers or rebellious angels of other systems.<sup>351</sup> Men's bodies correspond to (  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$  ) the  $\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\delta\epsilon\varsigma$  rather than being in (  $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha}$  ) the

εἰκὼν or εἰκόνις of Primal Man. Even the command to increase and multiply (18), the one identifiable echo of the biblical text (Gen. 1: 28), differs considerably from the LXX in wording and content in that it refers to the curse of corruptibility, as Haenchen expresses it.<sup>352</sup>

Unlike our previous examples there is virtually no trace of a Golem motif, but that is perhaps not surprising since this motif appears to be used to express the weakness of the anti-divine powers, the world-creating angels or archons, whereas the heavenly powers involved in the creation of earthly man in the Poimandres are far from hostile or impotent. On the contrary they are in harmony with the will of the supreme Father. But if there is no evidence of the influence of Gnostic ideas in this area, the fact that, as Haenchen suggests, the author has introduced the Gnostic doctrine of the God "Man", although in a watered-down version,<sup>353</sup> should make us cautious when evaluating the Poimandres with regard to questions of the origin and simplest form of that theme. The processes of editorial selection and adaptation must be presupposed and taken into account. Schenke claims that the double use of the image idea, (1) that the "inner man" is or has the image ( εἰκὼν ) of God, and (2) that the human body is also the image of God (since it corresponds to the εἶδος of the Man, who himself is God's image), in the light of the presence of Jewish motifs, supports his conjecture that the Gnostic doctrine of the God "Man" as reflected

here in Poimandres arises out of speculation on Gen. 1: 26f.<sup>354</sup> This contention, although suggestive, is not entirely convincing.<sup>355</sup>

Another text which reproduces, if in allusive and fragmentary fashion, the motifs of the heavenly Man and the descending image, is the version of the Gospel of the Egyptians in Codex III.<sup>356</sup> After relating the reproof to Sakla uttered by the heavenly voice, "Man exists and the Son of Man", the text continues: "Because of the descent (καταβασις) of the image (εἰκών) above, which is like its voice in the height of the image (εἰκών) which looked out, through the looking out of the image (εἰκών) above, the first creature (πλάσμα) was formed (πλασθεῖν)".<sup>357</sup> Despite the elliptical nature of this summary, we have here all the basic elements of the image-reflection motif. As in the Apocryphon, the Hypostasis and the Untitled Treatise, the heavenly voice is followed by the appearance of a heavenly figure. As with Pistis in the Untitled Treatise, the voice corresponds to, or belongs to, the figure.<sup>358</sup> This figure is described simply as an image which looks out, but which also in some sense descends (an echo of Jonas' idea (iii)). That on the basis of this image the first creature was formed seems to imply that this image bore some relation to the heavenly Man alluded to by the voice, and this similarity with other Gnostic texts appears to be confirmed by the allusions to Gen. 1: 26f. and 2: 7. Earthly man is fashioned by Sakla and his angels,<sup>359</sup> in accordance with the divine

image which appeared to them from above. The author has only a peripheral concern with the creation of man and thus we have none of the details found in other texts and no trace of the Golem motif. The way the motif is introduced as resulting from the Demiurge's arrogant boast; the reproof from heaven mentioning Man and the Son of Man; and the consequent appearance of the image, link this text with the Apocryphon and the Untitled Treatise rather than with Saturninus' version, which it superficially resembles in its simplicity and lack of detail.

As a final example of the image-reflection motif we might consider the Manichean version.<sup>360</sup> According to the account of Theodore bar Konai,<sup>361</sup> as part of the divine plan to rescue the trapped light-particles, the Third Envoy revealed his forms, male and female, and was seen by all the archons, the children of Darkness, male and female. At the sight of him all the archons were filled with desire - another recurrence of the, by now, familiar theme - males for his female form, females for his male. In their lust they began to emit the light which they had swallowed from the five luminous Gods, the sons of Primal Man. The sin which was in them was added and mingled itself with the moon which came from the sphere of the archons. The (Third) Envoy concealed his forms and separated the light from sin, which fell on the earth, half on the moist, half on the dry. The former became a horrible monster whom the Adamas of light conquered, the latter sprang

up into five trees.<sup>362</sup> The female archons, already pregnant, let their abortions fall on the ground at the sight of the Messenger and their abortions devoured the buds of the trees. The abortions thereupon recalled the form of the Envoy which they had seen and asked: "Where is that form which we saw?" Asaklun (i.e. Saklas?) the son of the king of Darkness said to them: "Give me your sons and daughters and I will make for you a form like the one you have seen". They did so and he devoured the males and gave the females to his consort Nebruel. The two united and Nebruel conceived and bore first Adam, then Eve.

As Schenke notes, a corresponding view occurs in the cosmogony from Turfan (III 260)<sup>363</sup> which describes how a figure designated Āz ("lust" or "desire", corresponding to Theodore's "sin") fell on to the moist and dry earth, how the female demons chained to the heavens saw the beauty of the God Rošņsahr (i.e. the Third Envoy), became filled with lust and let their abortions fall to the ground where they ate the fruits and thus absorbed the Āz.<sup>364</sup> Later we hear that Āz said: "According to those two figures, the female and the male, of the God Narisah, whom I saw, I will form these two creatures, the male and the female, as a garment . . . . and they will not escape me . . . .". Āz then put on all the offspring of the male and female demons, teaching the male and female archons Mazan and Asreštar (i.e. Saklas and Nebruel) to have intercourse. From this



serpent-children were born whom Āz took and ate, to form two creatures, a man and a woman, from them.<sup>365</sup> Thus the Āz formed the first man and the first woman according to that divine offspring (i.e. the Third Envoy) whom she had seen coming from the heavenly ship of light.<sup>366</sup>

As Schenke notes,<sup>367</sup> similar pictures occur in Augustine<sup>368</sup> and Alexander of Lycopolis,<sup>369</sup> and the general conception is confirmed and to some extent clarified by another original Manichean source, which may go back to a work of Mani himself, the Kephalaia. Chapter LV, entitled "Concerning the formation (  $\pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\epsilon\iota\nu$  ) of Adam", deals with the question posed by some of Mani's disciples as to whether God meant earthly man to be formed in the divine image. The reply runs that the (Third?) Envoy revealed his image (  $\epsilon\iota\kappa\acute{\omega}\nu$  ) in the world, the archons and powers saw it and formed their figures (  $\mu\epsilon\rho\phi\acute{\eta}$  ), i.e. Adam and Eve, after the image (  $\epsilon\iota\kappa\acute{\epsilon}$  ).<sup>370</sup> But this was not done simply to let the archons see the image, it was done to free the soul and the Son of God trapped in matter, to animate him<sup>371</sup> and prepare his redemption.<sup>372</sup> The archons were filled with desire (  $\epsilon\pi\iota\theta\upsilon\nu\epsilon\tilde{\iota}\nu$  - the same motif again) for this form (  $\mu\epsilon\rho\phi\acute{\eta}$  ) which was unparalleled in their realm, and sealed it in their hearts within their souls. Thereupon they framed it (feminine: the soul?) after its (i.e. the Envoy's) image (  $\epsilon\iota\kappa\acute{\epsilon}$  ), forming Adam and Eve. But their imitation was not a true one.<sup>373</sup> These points; the revelation of the image of the Third Envoy to all the archons and powers; not to

allow them to frame a figure after his image but to free his son, and the archons' desire for the image and forming of Adam and Eve against the divine will, are repeated.<sup>374</sup>

The instructor (Mani?) proceeds to outline how this formation after the image took place, in terms of three different formations (  $\pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\mu\alpha\varsigma$  ), the first that of water, the second combining earth and water, against whom Adamas of Light was sent (the horrible monster of Theodore's account?), the third the nature (  $\phi\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\iota\varsigma$  ) which fell on dry ground, formed the tree and entered it.<sup>375</sup> This provokes another question in the following chapter (LVI: "On Saklas and his powers"). If the abortions formed Adam and Eve, how had these abortions seen the image and laid it on their creation if they had not yet existed when the image appeared to their progenitors? The answer given is that Sin, which derived from the archons, and which is matter (Hyle:  $\psi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta$  ), ascended to the image but was severed and descended to earth. On descent she formed the tree, entered it and produced fruit. It was she who spoke through the archon who said to his consorts: "Give me your light and I will make you an image (  $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\kappa\acute{\omega}\nu$  ) after the image of the heavenly one". It was Sin then who saw the image and was in the fruit eaten by the archons. They formed Adam and Eve in the image of the heavenly one through the power of Sin in them.<sup>376</sup>

A final version, somewhat suspect because of its open hostility to Manicheism, is that of Hegemonius in the Acta Archelai. It does

contain a citation of Gen. 1: 26 in that the figure who says "Come let us create a man after our image and like us and after the form which we have seen" is identified as an archon who says to the other archons: "Come give me the light we have received and let us create a man after our, the archons', form and after the (form) we have seen", i.e. the First Man.<sup>377</sup> The gloss about the First Man being seen rather than the Third Envoy, as in the other accounts, suggests that the author has misunderstood the conception, and his reference to Gen. 1: 26 may be either his attempt - or that of the Manicheans - to relate their ideas to the biblical material.

The picture that emerges, despite differences in detail, is recognisable from our previous texts. A subordinate divine being, not God himself, appears as part of the divine plan to rescue Primal Man or rather his scattered light particles. One tradition (the Kephalaia) has the archons aroused by desire for this superior image and suggests that this image is somehow trapped or sealed in the archons' souls. They form Adam and Eve and lay the heavenly image on Adam.<sup>378</sup> This version is similar to that of the Hypostasis and the Untitled Treatise, apart from the fact that here the archons already possess elements of light. However, alongside and at times combined with this view is the idea that the powers who created Adam and Eve (i.e. the abortions produced by the female archons as a result of the theophany) did not actually see the divine image. They were able to form

Adam and Eve in the divine image because they consumed Sin who had seen and ascended to the image. This recalls the Ophite system described by Irenaeus which has Sophia Prunicus working through Ialdabaoth and the archons, and furnishing them with the thought of man. In this version (Theodore and the Turfan cosmogony) Adam and Eve are produced by the chief male and female demons through a combination of cannibalism and sexual intercourse. A further variant has Sin or Hyle herself create the fleshly image and lay the heavenly image in it (Kephalaia and Hegemonius).<sup>379</sup> Here she resembles the figure of Achamoth in Valentinianism who inspires the Demiurge, and can be called a Demiurge.<sup>380</sup> These latter versions clearly represent typically Manichean concerns such as the presence of light elements in nature as well as in man, the way they come to be trapped in man through the machinations of the archons, and the evil character of both matter and sex. The image idea does not appear to play a major role in these latter versions. Overall its main import would appear to be that Adam is formed after the image of the heavenly Envoy to attract down the light trapped in the archons and thus be a prison for the soul.<sup>381</sup> Although we have noted only one explicit reference to Gen. 1: 26, there are allusions to it in the Kephalaia, Theodore and Hegemonius<sup>382</sup> where it is put into the mouth of one archon addressing his colleagues, and Schenke would argue that here Manicheism is dependent on the Gnostic doctrine of the God "Man" - itself based on

Gen. 1: 26.<sup>383</sup> Adam is not represented as a Golem, although there are indications that the Primal Man trapped in matter might be considered as such.<sup>384</sup>

This completes our analysis of texts which contain the image-reflection motif but before we summarise our conclusions we ought to consider a number of texts which, if not explicitly containing the idea, do retain the conceptions of man made in the divine image by powers or the Demiurge, and of man thus created as a Golem.

The first of these is Hippolytus' account of the Naassenes. After citing a number of national traditions about the origin of man the Naassene writer records the views of the "Chaldaeans" about Adam. He, they say, was the man whom earth produced by herself.<sup>385</sup> And he lay without breath, without motion ( ἀκίνητος ) without a tremor ( ἀσάλευτος ),<sup>386</sup> like a statue ( ἀνδρίδας ), being an image ( εἰκόνα ) of that celestial being praised in song, the Man Adamas. He was made by the many powers, who are severally described at great length.<sup>387</sup> In order that the great Man from on high should be completely held fast, the text continues, there was given to him also a soul, that, through his soul, suffering and punishment in slavery might come upon the creation ( πλάσματος ) of the perfect Man.<sup>388</sup> The origin of the soul then becomes a matter for investigation. Here we have the Golem motif, but interpreted in completely the reverse fashion from our previous examples. In this case, as Schottroff

correctly argues,<sup>389</sup> the soul must be seen as a negative element, not a divine gift, and the immobile and lifeless state of the Golem made in the divine image is positive, since it is characteristic of the divine, as our text points out, to set everything else in motion, while itself remaining motionless.<sup>390</sup> Elsewhere, however, the soul is not described as entirely negative, since the male power of the soul can ascend.<sup>391</sup> The soul in fact is ambivalent or two-fold: it can ascend or descend, being the intermediate principle of the three principles which the Naassenes assert to be fundamental.<sup>392</sup> The soul can thus be seen as that which traps the heavenly inner man in the world, or it can be seen as two-fold with a lower and a higher element. At times it even appears to designate the heavenly element or inner man awakened and led to salvation by the Redeemer.<sup>393</sup>

In spite, however, of the inconsistencies of the varying traditions and bewildering ambivalence of language and imagery used by the author, a basic picture does emerge of a divine element (seed, soul, inner man) representing the image of the heavenly Man, Adamas, being somehow brought down into the earthly creation of a Demiurge or subordinate powers and trapped there.<sup>394</sup> The fundamental dualism of this scheme is interpreted in terms of a three-fold division in that we have the intermediate psychic element with its capacity to ascend, on the one hand, but its negative characteristics (the principle of life and hence suffering for man in the divine image) on the other.

Although the idea that all three elements are present in man (the Geryon motif) is regarded by Schottroff as not belonging to the Naassene Preaching proper, which she sees as purely dichotomous in its anthropology,<sup>395</sup> it does seem to underlie the Golem motif in that heavenly Man must somehow be present in the creature formed by the powers if he is to be punished by the insertion of a soul.<sup>396</sup> No details are offered as to why or how the fall took place. There is the suggestion at one point<sup>397</sup> that man was created by unspecified powers (Golem motif), whereas elsewhere the Demiurge is designated as the creator of the visible world (including man?).<sup>398</sup> That man is the image ( εἰκών ) of a divine being and that he is called a creation ( πλάσμα ) appear to be the only evidence of the immediate influence of Gen. 1 and 2.

Secondly, we have the well-known fragment of Valentinus preserved by Clement of Alexandria<sup>399</sup> in which the former appears to have in mind a mythological treatment of the creation of man which is almost completely lacking in the heresiologists' accounts of his followers. Discussing the maxim "the fear ( φόβος ) of God (sic) is the beginning of wisdom" (Prov. 1: 7), Clement relates that the followers of Basilides said in explanation of this verse that the Archon himself, when he heard the utterance of the ministering Spirit, was shocked by what was heard and seen, since he had received good news beyond his expectations, and his shock was called fear, which became



the beginning of the wisdom of distinction of kinds etc.<sup>400</sup> Clement goes on to say that Valentinus seems to have had something similar in mind in a letter in which he wrote that, just as fear ( φόβος ) fell on the angels in the presence of that creature ( πλάσματος ) when it emitted greater things than its creation (justified), because of the one who had invisibly deposited in him a seed of the substance above and expressed himself freely, so also among the generations of men of this world the works of men become objects of fear ( φόβος ) to those who make them. Such is the case with statues and images ( εἰκόν ) and everything made by hands in the name of a god. For Adam being fashioned ( πλάσσειν ) in the name of Man ( Ἀνθρώπου ) inspired fear ( φόβος ) of the pre-existent Man as if (or because ? ὥς δὲ ) he was in him.<sup>401</sup> They (the angels) were terrified and quickly concealed (or marred? ἀφαιρίσειν) their work.<sup>402</sup> Valentinus' account seems to presuppose that the angels created man, as craftsmen create idols, not only in the name of a god (here Anthropos whose name must be Adam<sup>403</sup>) but also in some sense in the divine image. As in the later systems, earthly man has a seed of the superior (i.e. spiritual?) substance secretly deposited in him which is responsible for his speaking.

Whether Valentinus actually affirms that the heavenly pre-existent Man is present in earthly man, and thus to be equated with the seed, is not entirely clear. Certainly the later systems have the aeon Man as one of the primary Ogdoad and can refer to the spiritual

seed or element as the spiritual man.<sup>404</sup> As I have already suggested,<sup>405</sup> Valentinus' version, which may not reflect his developed system, marks a transition from a more mythological motif (man made by the angels in the image of heavenly Man who appears to them) to a more abstract demythologised version which denies the crude visual imagery and has the Demiurge create from two kinds of matter, one in his image, the other in his likeness, i.e. consubstantial with him. This is the Ptolemaean version which we will consider later. Characteristic of the transition, and of Valentinianism in general, is the idea of the seed being secretly inserted, which tends to make the use of the Golem motif superfluous.

However, a document has turned up among the Nag Hammadi tractates which seems to be closely akin to Valentinianism: indeed it has been given the title "A Valentinian Exposition" (CG XI,2) and is described by Elaine Pagels, who has written the introduction to the English translation, as the only original account of the Valentinian Sophia myth of creation and redemption.<sup>406</sup> This document does suggest that a more mythological conception of the creation of man existed in Valentinianism than the heresiological evidence had led us to expect, and thus Valentinus' position and myth do not appear so isolated. The text records that the Demiurge began to create a man according to his image ( *εἰκὼν* ) on the one hand and on the other according to the likeness ( *εἰκὼς* ) of those who exist from the first (the Aeons of the Pleroma, including Man?). This was the dwelling

place she (Sophia?) used for the seeds.<sup>407</sup> This version, with its distinction based on Gen. 1: 26 and its single creator, represents a further step towards that of the Ptolemaeans to which we now turn.

They appear to have taken the process of demythologisation even further. There is no trace either of the image-reflection motif (at least not in its mythological form), or of a plurality of creators. The Demiurge, after forming the world out of the hylic and psychic substances solidified out of Achamoth's passions, formed choic man, not of present dry land, but of invisible (hylic) substance, and breathed into him the psychic man.

This is man "after the image and likeness" (Gen. 1: 26), "After the image" refers to the hylic man who is similar to, but not consubstantial with God (i.e. the Demiurge), "After the likeness" refers to psychic man, hence his substance is also called the "breath of life" (Gen. 2: 7). Finally, a coat of skin, i.e. flesh, was put on him.<sup>408</sup> However, the concept of the image is not entirely absent. Rather it is here present not in a mythological but in a philosophical, i.e. Platonic form. The whole Valentinian scheme is built on the premise, developed from Platonism, that the earthly world is an image or copy of the heavenly spiritual world, that earthly figures like the Demiurge and man are copies of heavenly aeons of the Pleroma, and that earthly events mirror prior heavenly ones. On this premise the Demiurge is the image of the supreme Father<sup>409</sup> and earthly man, although in the

likeness of the Demiurge, is yet an image of the Man of the Pleroma. But in line with this much more abstract and philosophical approach which insists that the image does not refer to something visible but to something invisible and incorporeal, the cruder mythological conceptions are abandoned or reinterpreted. There are no more heavenly voices and images in the waters of chaos. The Demiurge works in ignorance of the heavenly realm (this is the Gnostic twist of the Platonic theme), inspired and guided by his mother, Sophia Achamoth. Substance, image, likeness are all purely incorporeal, in a manner reminiscent of Philo's Platonic reinterpretation of Genesis.<sup>410</sup> The single Demiurge over against the creator angels may also be explained as part of the Ptolemaean drive to assimilate their theology to the Christianity of the Great Church.

This brings us, in conclusion, to the Ophites of Irenaeus' account. Ostensibly they have no trace of the image-reflection motif. According to them, when all the powers were thrown into confusion by the heavenly rebuke to Ialdabaoth, to divert their attention and keep them on his side he said "Come, let us make a man in our image (  $\epsilon\iota\kappa\acute{o}\nu\alpha\varsigma\ \eta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$  : ad imaginem nostram)". When the six powers heard this - Sophia gave them the thought (excogitatio) of the man so that through him she might empty them of their governing (or original? principalis) power - they came together and formed a man of enormous breadth and length.<sup>411</sup> But since he could only

wriggle,<sup>412</sup> they carried him to their father. Sophia contrived this too so as to empty him also of his trace of light, so that he would not be able to rise up against those above in virtue of the power he possessed. As he breathed into the man the breath of life (Gen. 2: 7) he was unwittingly emptied of power. But the man thus got Nous and Enthymesis and it is these which are saved; and at once he thanked First Man forsaking his creators.<sup>413</sup> Although in this case earthly man is created in the image of the Demiurge by his offspring, as Epiphanius' account confirms, yet they were given the mental picture (excogitatio) of a man, or even perhaps of heavenly Man, by Sophia. But the enormous man so fashioned is a wriggling Golem until animated by Ialdabaoth, who unwittingly transmitted the trace of light, which can also be interpreted in terms of the intellect (νοῦς). Once again it is the archons who create, as with the Apocryphon, Saturninus, the Hypostasis and Valentinus, while the Demiurge inbreathes the vital principle, as with the Apocryphon, and, in a sense, the Hypostasis. In the latter case man is only animated by the consequent descent of the Spirit.<sup>414</sup> The idea of man as a mental conception may reflect Platonic interpretation of Gen. 1: 26, while the inbreathing of the Demiurge is clearly a conscious allusion to Gen. 2: 7. The general theological tone of the Ophite scheme, stressing the integrity of the trace of light and Sophia's superiority, makes possible a less dualistic scheme which incorporates Ialdabaoth as a vehicle of the divine. Thus the image-reflection motif

is not required to explain how the light or light-Man was lured down into darkness and inserted into earthly man. What is important is not man being in the divine image, but man's divine element, his Nous.<sup>415</sup>

To summarise the results of our analysis:

1. The image-reflection motif whereby light is attracted to darkness and vice versa is used in both Gnostic cosmogonies (Basilides' "barbarians", Plotinus' Gnostics, etc.) and anthropogonies (Saturninus, Poimandres, Hypostasis, etc.) to account for the tragic mixture of the two elements. However, in both fields we have noted a similar tendency to weaken the force of this. Only a reflection or a subordinate heavenly being actually falls or descends.
2. The elements of desire and love ( *ἔρως* ) recur in most of the texts considered in explanation both of the fall of the light (Poimandres, Pistis Sophia) and the initiative of darkness (Basilides' "barbarians", the Pronoia of the Untitled Treatise). These cruder, anthropomorphic elements are reinterpreted but not entirely removed in more sophisticated systems (e.g. Valentinianism). Conversely they undergo even further development at the hands of the Manichees.
3. While the image-reflection motif is not present in all the texts considered, the idea of a heavenly being, almost invariably heavenly Anthropos, with whom the inner spark, seed or man of the Gnostic is identified, is. Corresponding to the force of the sexual metaphor, this heavenly figure can be female (Aphtharsia of the Hypostasis, Sophia

of the Untitled Treatise, Manichean Envoy seducing the archons), male (the Man of the Apocryphon, light-Adam of the Untitled Treatise, the Manichean Envoy) or androgynous (Anthropos of the Poimandres). Where no heavenly image appears (i.e. Ophites, Naassenes, Valentinus, Sophia of Jesus Christ, Mandeans) we still have heavenly Man. Thus while speculation on Gen. 1: 26 may have played a significant role in the development of the Gnostic doctrine of heavenly Man, it does not entirely explain it. However, this does not rule out Gnostic use of other verses from Genesis, e.g. Gen. 1: 2-3, to confirm or elaborate Gnostic ideas about a heavenly Man of Light.

4. Correspondingly, the variety of interpretation of Gen. 1: 26f.

(man made in the divine image, made in the Demiurge's image, made in the image of the archons and the likeness of heavenly Man) also suggests that the text is being used to illustrate and confirm an existing Gnostic belief (the consubstantiality of salvator and salvandus).

Significantly, that man is made in the divine image is frequently presented as an archontic device to trap heavenly Man and his light (Hypostasis, Untitled Treatise, Apocryphon). Gnostic interpretation of the Platonic theory of ideas as expressed in mythical form in the Timaeus also plays a significant part which must not be underestimated (e.g. Ptolemaeans, Apocryphon, etc.).

5. The motif of the Golem is a favourite device of the Gnostics to express the impotence of the archons. Its simplest and possibly



earliest form, echoing rabbinic speculations (only partly based on Gen. 1: 26, 2: 7 and Ps. 139: 5, 16) that saw man created first as a formless mass, then infused with a soul, occurs in Saturninus; the angels create man in the image of a divine light-being, but he only wriggles and is animated and set upright by a heavenly spark. However, its authentic Gnostic form admits that not only the body is the handiwork of hostile forces, but the soul too. Thus even the Naassene version (pace Schottroff) seems to presuppose a three-fold scheme: body created by the archons in the divine image, ambivalent soul, whose origin is debated, but which enslaves the third, divine element, spirit, which descends from heavenly Man and is consubstantial with him. To express this three-fold scheme (hylic, psychic, pneumatic), the reference in Gen. 2: 7 to God's inbreathing the breath of life is introduced (Hypostasis) or developed (Ophites, Untitled Treatise, Ptolemaeans).<sup>416</sup> However, the motif can be interpreted in reverse: being immobile and soulless is characteristic of the divine (Naassenes), and its anthropological reference is instantly translatable into a soteriological one (Sophia of Jesus Christ)<sup>417</sup>. Thus it can appear independently of the image-reflection motif (Mandeans).

6. In this regard, one cannot fail to notice the numerous parallels with the rabbis and Philo. There is the idea of the creation of man in two stages on the basis of Gen. 1: 26 and 2: 7 which they interpret in their characteristically different ways.<sup>418</sup> There is the Golem motif

which the rabbis derive from Ps. 139: 5, 16 although they discuss it in the context of Gen. 1: 26.<sup>419</sup> Here, of course, God first creates man, then after a while infuses soul into him. This idea is developed in terms of stages or hours of the day, in which Adam is successively a shapeless Golem, equipped with limbs, infused with soul and raised on his feet.<sup>420</sup> This illuminates elements of the Gnostic version of the Golem motif, as do the ideas of angelic hostility to the creation of Adam and their mistaking Adam for a divine being and attempting to worship him.<sup>421</sup> There are details (e.g. Adam's size) and features (e.g. the etymologies of Adam, the Instructor, and Eve) which clearly echo rabbinic material. The early picture of the angelic creation of Adam as Golem and his subsequent animation from above, in Saturninus, may well derive from heterodox Jewish groups who affirmed that the angels took it upon themselves to create man in the divine image, but that because of their impotence he could only crawl and lacked a soul until God inbreathed one, causing the man to speak and stand erect and prompting the angels in joy and relief to praise him. However, such motifs have undergone a drastic process of selection, readaptation and editing by the various Gnostic groups, to make them express their own particular theological insights.

7. Thus, while the Apocryphon and the Ophites of Irenaeus adv.haer. I 30 differ in their presentation of the creation and animation of man (the Apocryphon has the image-reflection motif; has Ialdabaoth and

the seven as creators; relates a first psychic formation of an immobile Golem and has five heavenly light-beings in disguise prevail on Ialdabaoth to breathe his power of light into the Golem rather than Sophia, who in fact requires redemption, while the Ophites omit or reinterpret the image motif; have Ialdabaoth and six as creators of a wriggling Golem and present Sophia as the Redeemer who effects Ialdabaoth's inbreathing of his power whereby man gets Nous), both reflect the same optimism about the superiority and integrity of the divine light in the struggle with darkness. Thus both can present the Demiurge as unwittingly the channel of divine light into man, a position developed in the Ptolemaean school of Valentinianism, in which the Demiurge represents the intermediate or psychic level in creation and salvation. The cruder dualism of Saturninus, on the other hand, is more evident in the Hypostasis and the Untitled Treatise where Ialdabaoth has many diabolic features. But here too there are the elements of a three-fold scheme in the position of Sabaoth and the use of Gen. 2: 7 to suggest the psychic level.

#### The multiple creations of Adam

Although the series of divine moves and archontic counter-moves in the creation and animation of Adam, as presented by the Apocryphon and other texts, belongs in a sense to soteriology, as Schottroff has persuasively argued,<sup>422</sup> the variety of creations has

a strong claim to be treated in the context of anthropology. We shall look briefly therefore at the way the Apocryphon and related texts present man's creation, in terms first of man's formation by seven powers,<sup>423</sup> then of his arrangement by 360 or 365 angels,<sup>424</sup> and finally of his being trapped in a material body made of the four elements, earth, water, fire and air.<sup>425</sup>

On the first point, man's creation by the seven powers, it is important to note that the Apocryphon records that this is a psychic creation, unlike e.g. the Hypostasis which has the archons creating man from dust, in closer dependence on Genesis.<sup>426</sup> According to the short recension, each power (the archons appear to be the subject)<sup>427</sup> creates a soul from his own power according to the divine image.<sup>428</sup> The long recension speaks instead of the powers creating by means of each others' powers, in accordance with the signs given them, each power supplying a characteristic according to the form of the image he had seen in its (or from his) psychic (nature? form?).<sup>429</sup> This looks like an elaboration of the rather bald statement in the short recension, making clear just why the powers can create souls or psychic substances. That all four texts mention the man's being made in imitation of the first perfect Man was probably responsible for the introduction of the following archontic exclamation: "Let us call him Adam that his name (BG and CG III add "and power") may be a power of light (BG and CG III have "light" only) for us".<sup>430</sup>

The powers begin, but while all four texts are in almost total agreement about the psychic substances created, respectively bone, sinew, flesh, marrow, blood, skin and hair,<sup>431</sup> the two recensions differ in their list of the powers, the long recension reproducing its earlier order (Goodness, Pronoia, Divinity, Lordship, Kingship, Zeal, Understanding (  $\text{ΜΝΤΡΜΝΖΗΤ}$  )),<sup>432</sup> the short recension presenting its earlier order with the first-mentioned power in fourth position (Divinity, Lordship, Zeal, Pronoia, Kingship, Understanding, Wisdom (  $\text{σοφία}$  )).<sup>433</sup> As we have already argued,<sup>434</sup> the list of psychic substances ought probably to have begun with the marrow, and the short recension may be aware of this in that it has changed the order of Pronoia. Certainly the version of this list preserved in Theodore bar Konai and attributed to the Audians of the fourth century<sup>435</sup> with slight emendation appears closest to the short version.<sup>436</sup> A similar conception occurs in the Untitled Treatise. The seven archons form man so that his body resembles theirs but his likeness that of Light-Adam. His moulded body was formed according to a portion of each of them, their chief (Ialdabaoth?) creating the head and the marrow.<sup>437</sup> Man thus formed is described as becoming psychic (  $\text{ψυχικός}$  )<sup>438</sup> although the text stoutly denies that he has a soul.<sup>439</sup> What we appear to have here is what Jonas has described as the planetary equipping of the soul.<sup>440</sup> The seven are planetary powers, as was hinted at in the cosmogonic section of the Apocryphon.<sup>441</sup>

Just such an association between the planets and elements of the body is made in an Iranian text<sup>442</sup> which Zaehner argues is Zervanite.<sup>443</sup> There the Moon is compared with the marrow, Mercury with the bones, Venus with flesh, the Sun with the sinews, Mars with the veins, Jupiter with the skin and Saturn with the hair. In the Poimandres too the seven first men are procreated in accordance with the natures of the Seven Governors who control the planetary spheres.<sup>444</sup> Although the Governors are presented in an entirely positive light in the cosmogony, as are these archontic powers of the Apocryphon, as far as their names are concerned, in both texts the hostile and evil character of these powers later becomes evident. The Governors of the Poimandres become planetary zones who are responsible for fate ( *εἰσπραμένη* ) and whose negative characteristics are successively stripped off by the ascending Gnostic soul or self,<sup>445</sup> while the powers of the Apocryphon produce fate ( *εἰσπραμένη* ) to bind all beings in heaven and earth - a wicked and perverse plan - as the author describes it.<sup>446</sup> Finally, the Mandaeans represent the creators of man as the Demiurge, Ptahil, and the seven planets.<sup>447</sup>

But not content with this, the Apocryphon goes on to relate, secondly, how the angels associated with the powers were also involved in this creation. The version in Codex II is the clearest at this point and according to it the multitude of angels received from the powers the seven psychic substances ( *ὑποστασεις* ) in order to create the

composition of the limbs and the composition of the pieces and their interconnection.<sup>448</sup> The short recension compresses their activity into a single sentence<sup>449</sup> while the long goes into elaborate and loving detail.<sup>450</sup> Whether the short recension omitted this passage or the long added it is hard to tell: one suspects the latter.<sup>451</sup> Giversen subjects the list to a painstaking analysis, dividing it into a passage dealing with the creation of the individual parts of the body (15, 29-17, 6), a second passage on the same theme and repeating material from the first, but involving fewer angels (17, 8-32) and then a distinct section dealing with the powers ruling man's abilities and passions (17, 32-19, 2).<sup>452</sup> At the end of this latter section mention is made of the head of the material (ὕλικός) soul (ψυχὴ).<sup>453</sup> This concept appears to recur in the following lines, which summarise the creative work of the 365 angels. They all worked on it until the psychic (ψυχικός) and material (ὕλικός) body (σῶμα) was completed.<sup>454</sup> But this appears to be contradicted or ignored a few lines later in another summary: all the angels and demons worked until they had constructed the psychic (ψυχικός) body (σῶμα).<sup>455</sup> The long recension, now rejoined by the short, then treats the immobility and animation of the Golem, Adam.

The contradiction can perhaps best be explained by understanding the mention of the material soul or body as an integral part of the description of man's creation which the editors of the long recension



have inserted into the original text. The latter was only concerned with the psychic creation and the inconsistency betrays a literary seam.

The idea of a material soul or body is, of course, not unfamiliar:

it occurs in Valentinian anthropology which represents the Demiurge as first creating the earthly, material, irrational soul, then inserting

in it the psychic man or soul, for which the material soul acts as flesh.<sup>456</sup>

In our text the material soul or body is probably to be related to the third section detected by Giversen, concerning the demons who rule over the four cardinal human passions (17, 32-19, 2) whose mother is admitted to be matter (ὁ λυγ : 18, 5f.). If man is at this point still psychic, as the Apocryphon insists, i.e. invisible and incorporeal, and if he is described as being liable to the passions, one must posit a material soul or body, which of course still remains invisible and incorporeal, to be the subject of these passions. This is precisely the answer given by the Valentinians in that not only are their pneumatic and psychic elements invisible and incorporeal, but their hylic is also. Flesh or matter is thus a fourth element on top of the other three. One cannot rule out the possibility therefore, that this section in the long version bears some relation to Valentinian ideas.<sup>457</sup>

The variation in numbers of the angels between the versions (365 in the long, 360 in the short) may be derived from different fields, the 365 days of the year or the 360 degrees of astronomy,

astrology and geometry.<sup>458</sup> Certainly the former number is paralleled in both Epiphanius' account of Basilides<sup>459</sup> and the Pistis Sophia.<sup>460</sup> According to Epiphanius, Basilides derived man's 365 bodily parts from the 365 heavens, each part corresponding to an individual heavenly power, while Pistis Sophia has the Rulers tell their 365 servitors what type of soul-compound they are to insert into the body of the matter of the world. Perhaps the allusion in the Naassene Preaching to Adam's creation by the many powers "who are severally described at great length (ὧς . . . . . πολλοὶ ὁ λόγος),<sup>461</sup> might be interpreted as a reference to a passage such as that preserved in the long recension of the Apocryphon.

Finally, we have the account in the Apocryphon of how the archons and their powers, disturbed by the superiority of Adam, formed another creature of the four elements and put it on Adam as a tomb or fetter. This idea is introduced as one of a series of counter-moves by the Demiurge and his powers in reaction to the animation (i.e. redemption) of Adam by a series of Redeemer figures and redemptive acts. The Mother (i.e. Sophia) had asked for help for the immobile Golem. The Autogenes had descended with the four lights - disguised as angels of the First Archon - and persuaded him to breathe some of his spirit (i.e. the power of light) into Adam. As a result Adam moved and became superior to his creators. They in turn brought him down to the regions beneath matter. Again heaven intervened, the merciful

Father sending a helper (Gen. 2: 18?) the good spirit, the Epinoia of light, who concealed herself in him - once more elevating the man above his creators.<sup>462</sup> As a further expression of the pre-temporal fall of man through the activity of the Demiurge and his powers, there then follows the motif of psychic man being trapped in a material body made of the four elements.

The archons and their powers mingle fire, earth and water<sup>463</sup> with the four fiery winds, bring Adam into the shadow of death and form another creation as a cave (CG II, CG III) or tomb (BG), the fetter of oblivion, from earth, water, fire and spirit,<sup>464</sup> which the Apocryphon characteristically reinterprets as matter, darkness, desire and the opposing (BG, CG II) or counterfeit (CG III) spirit.<sup>465</sup> The psychic man is thus trapped in the material body. The explanation of earthly man's origin in ch.17 of the Poimandres echoes the same idea: the earth represented the female element, water the male, fire the maturation principle and air the spirit. From these Nature produced the men, with their souls and minds from heavenly Man's characteristics, life and light. The theme of man created from the four elements occurs both in Christian apocrypha<sup>466</sup> and in Chaldean lore.<sup>467</sup> Zosimus' account of the latter in fact presents us with the Gnostic understanding of man's situation in a nutshell: when Light/Man (ϕῶς) was in Paradise, being inbreathed (? εἰσπνεύεσθαι) by Fate (εἰμαρμένη), they (the archons?) persuaded him as

being guileless (ἀκακος) and inactive (ἀνεργητος) to put on their Adam, the one belonging to Fate (ἐξουμότης), of the four elements. Being guileless he did not refuse. Thereupon they boasted over his enslavement.<sup>468</sup> The parallels with the Apocryphon are striking.

But one should also not overlook the idea of man made of the four elements found in Plato<sup>469</sup> and in Philo.<sup>470</sup> According to the Timaeus, the young gods, the offspring of the Demiurge, imitating him, took the immortal principle of the mortal creature, then took portions of fire, earth, water and air, bound them together and in each body bound the revolutions of the immortal soul. Philo asserts that in respect of his intellect (διάνους) every man is allied to the divine Logos, being a part, fragment or ray of the blessed nature, but in his bodily structure he is allied to the world, for he is compounded of the same things, earth and water, air and fire. How readily this could be interpreted in a Gnostic sense is evident.

The Apocryphon's version of an original, incomplete psychic creation involving a multitude of creators, followed by a material one as a trap for the creature animated from above, is one way of explaining how man came to be a union of soul and body in which was also present a divine spark or spirit which represented his true essential self. Another explanation is offered by the Ophites of Irenaeus more in line with the account of the Fall in Genesis 3.

When originally created Adam and Eve had as it were spiritual bodies, but once cast out of paradise these became more sluggish, as did their souls, since their creator had only inbreathed a worldly breath. Sophia Prunicus took pity on them and restored a whiff of the sweetness of the trace of light. Thereby they recognised their nudity, material bodies and mortality.<sup>471</sup> Similarly, in the Apocalypse of Adam, Adam and Eve, although created of earth, walked in a glory seen by Eve in the aeon from which they had come forth. They also possessed knowledge of the eternal God communicated by Eve, thus resembling the great eternal angels superior to the Demiurge who had created them. When the Demiurge and his powers divided them in wrath they lost that glory and knowledge, became slaves of the Demiurge, under the power of death. But Adam is awakened from his oblivion by three revealer figures who foretell the future of the Gnostics, the seed of Adam's son, Seth.<sup>472</sup> The last two texts are clearly influenced by Jewish traditions about Adam, but all three, despite their different ways of presenting man's fall into the world of matter and decay, insist that the divine is something in addition to their natural endowments of body and soul, the handiwork of the Demiurge. It comes to them from above, be it described as the Epinoia of Light, a trace of light, or glory and knowledge. Precisely the same point is true of the Ptolemaean anthropology. The spirit or seed is sown from above and is not a natural endowment. Very few in fact possess it.<sup>473</sup>

### The creation of Eve

It would not be proper to conclude a treatment of Gnostic anthropology without some reference to the creation of the first woman. But despite the crucial importance of the feminine principle for the Apocryphon, the Ophites, the Valentinians and all Gnostic schools or documents related to the Syro-Egyptian tradition of Jonas' classification, the earthly Eve does not play a significant role in Gnostic anthropology. She occurs in the Gnostic Paradise accounts which are best interpreted as soteriological rather than anthropological statements. They represent man's plight and his redemption in terms of the events of Genesis, the Trees of Paradise, the naming of the animals, Adam's sleep and the creation of Eve, the serpent, Adam and Eve's transgression and expulsion, the birth of Cain, Abel and Seth and so on. Earthly Eve is frequently transmuted into the heavenly spiritual woman, the Instructor, who comes to sleeping Adam, awakens him and raises him up.<sup>474</sup>

However, both the Apocryphon<sup>475</sup> and the Ophites of Irenaeus' account<sup>476</sup> recount the creation of earthly Eve, which in both is a device of Ialdabaoth to empty Adam of his power of light. The Apocryphon has Ialdabaoth cast oblivion (not a sleep as in Gen. 2: 21) over Adam in an attempt to bring out the Epinoia of light concealed in him. This fails and so he makes a further creation of female shape (CG II adds "after (  $\text{K}\alpha\text{r}\acute{\alpha}$  ) the image (  $\text{ΕΙΝΕ}$  ) of the Epinoia which had appeared to him"), and transfers into it the part he had taken from the

power of the man. It was not a rib but this part, the text insists, again correcting Genesis (2: 21f.), which he took.<sup>477</sup> Irenaeus' version has Ialdabaoth, full of jealousy, wanting to devise a scheme to empty the man by means of a woman. From his own Enthymesis (thought) he brought forth a woman whom Prunicus invisibly emptied of power. This last point seems to imply that Ialdabaoth's plan worked, which would give us a closer parallel to the Apocryphon than might at first appear.

The Hypostasis also seems to envisage the creation of Eve as an archontic plan to empty Adam of his spirit. Following Genesis more closely than the Apocryphon, it has the archons cast a deep sleep, interpreted in similar fashion as ignorance, over Adam. They then open up his side like a living woman and build up his side with flesh in her place (Gen. 2: 21). Thereupon, Adam becomes completely psychic.<sup>478</sup> Bullard is probably correct to interpret this passage in terms of the original androgyny of Adam.<sup>479</sup> His female side is removed and formed into a living woman, the spiritual woman, thus depriving Adam of his spirit, and the gap is filled up with flesh. But the spiritual woman at once awakens and animates Adam,<sup>480</sup> and later appears in the guise of the serpent, the Instructor,<sup>481</sup> which suggests that she has a soteriological rather than an anthropological role. The abrupt mention of the fleshly (σαρκικός) woman, without any indication of how or when she came into existence, indicates that



the Hypostasis has not worked out a satisfactory way of combining the Gnostic interpretation of Eve as the spiritual woman with the account in Genesis which, nevertheless, it is attempting to follow as closely as possible.

The Untitled Treatise solves this problem by abandoning the idea that Eve was in any sense formed from Adam while developing the idea of Eve as the spiritual woman who produces psychic Adam, and who as the Instructor arouses Adam. The archontic reaction to this is to try to ravish her so that once defiled she will be unable to return to her light. They will then bring an oblivion over Adam and instruct him in his sleep, misleading him into believing that she originated from his rib, and thus making her subservient to him.<sup>482</sup> Needless to say, Eve is well aware of their plan and leaves her (psychic?) likeness behind for them to defile. What in fact they do defile is their own body.<sup>483</sup>

In these Gnostic texts Eve is interpreted in two ways:

- (1) she is a Redeemer figure, the spiritual woman wakening man from his stupor (Apocryphon, Hypostasis, Untitled Treatise);
- (2) her separation from Adam marks the beginning of the processes of generation, decay and death (Valentinians,<sup>484</sup> Apocalypse of Adam, Poimandres). Indeed some texts attempt to relate both ideas. In the Apocryphon and Irenaeus' Ophites on the one hand, Eve is a vehicle of light-power but also the originator of reproduction,

whereas on the other, the Untitled Treatise distinguishes the spiritual Eve who remains unaffected by the archons' sexual overtures, from the psychic or fleshly Eve, her likeness, who is the actual object of them.

Having concluded an analysis of the fundamental mythologoumena of Gnostic anthropogony and anthropology, let us summarise our findings. As a result of our preliminary analysis we detected three basic anthropological theories: (1) that heavenly Primal Man or his image fell or descended into matter; (2) that earthly man was made in the image of God, or heavenly Man, an emanation from God; and (3) that a part of earthly man is consubstantial with the Godhead. This last appeared to us to be the most comprehensive and the theory most suited to expressing the basic anthropological dualism of divine spirit versus body and soul which characterises Gnostic theology. We then considered the motif of the blasphemy of the Demiurge and the reproof from heaven, examining the significance and background of the figures of Man and Son of Man. We concluded that texts which united the two (Ophites, Apocryphon, Gospel of the Egyptians) were primary, noting the intimate association of Man and Son of Man with the creation, regeneration and salvation of earthly man. We detected three motifs at work here, combined in various ways: (1) that of heavenly Man and his Son (and his son), found e.g. in the Ophite system, Eugnostos and the Sophia; (2) that of the triad Father, Mother and Son, found e.g. in

the Apocryphon and Gospel of the Egyptians; and (3) that of heavenly Adamas and his son, Seth, found e.g. in the Apocryphon and the Gospel of the Egyptians. As regards the origin of the motif of the heavenly voice, we were struck by the parallels with the treatment of Ps. 8: 5-7 in relation to Gen. 1 in rabbinic sources and with the Christological interpretation of the psalm in Hebrews, and suggested that the Gnostics were using the same kind of traditions in the construction and development of their mythologoumenon of archontic arrogance and divine reproof. The version of the motif in the Apocryphon we considered closest to the original.

We then turned to the image-reflection motif which as we indicated, could be used cosmologically as well as anthropologically, and in both cases by non-Christian Gnostics (Basilides' "barbarians" and the Poimandres). This calls into question Schenke's hypothesis that the source of this motif lay in speculation on Gen. 1: 26f. We noted the importance of the theme of love ( $\epsilon\rho\omega\varsigma$ ) and the fact that a number of texts appeared to make no use of the image-reflection motif whereas they all retained the ideas of heavenly Man or his equivalent and of a divine spark of seed present in earthly man. Where the motif did occur, it was frequently employed in a negative sense, in terms of a caricature or bait to explain how the light came to descend into matter. But even then the trick backfired or was explained as all being part of a prior divine plan. The variety of interpretation of

Gen. 1: 26 tended to suggest that it was being used more to illustrate and confirm an existing idea (the divine element in man) than as an ultimate source for that idea. Heavenly Man was present where the image-likeness motif was not. We also noted that the motif of the Golem formed an integral part of the image-reflection motif, although it too could be used independently of it (e.g. in the Mandeian anthropogony and in the description of the Redeemer's activity in the Gospel of Truth). In Gnostic anthropology it generally expresses the impotence of the anti-divine powers responsible for man's body and his soul, although it can be used to express the divine immobility (as in the Naassene Preaching). However, we argued that its characteristic Gnostic form requires not a two-fold scheme (as in Saturninus), but a three-fold scheme whereby a psychic element is introduced, usually by the inbreathing of the Demiurge (Gen. 2: 7). Once more comparisons with the rabbis and Philo suggested that while the Gnostics were drawing on the same stock of ideas and mythologoumena (angelic involvement in, or hostility to, Adam's creation, a two-stage or gradual creation, Adam as a vast Golem etc.), they interpreted them in their own very different manner. The greater detail in the Apocryphon and absence of the reflection motif in the Ophite system can be explained in terms of different traditions and theological impulses, but both texts are united in their evaluation of the Demiurge as the vehicle for transmitting the light element into earthly man, a theme which also

links them with Valentinianism.

As regards the further motifs of the multiple creation of Adam and the figure of Eve, we saw the first as an attempt to explain man's present plight of being aware of himself as a divine spark trapped in a body possessing a soul which was governed by Fate and buried in matter. The original scheme of angelic creation and divine inspiration is here developed and the trapping of Adam in matter marks the beginning of the soteriological motif of archontic move and divine counter-move. Corresponding to this interpretation of man's fall in the Apocryphon, the Ophites of Irenaeus depict man as cast out of Paradise and declining from his original bodily and psychic state while the Apocalypse of Adam interprets the fall as Adam and Eve losing their original glory and knowledge on being separated by the Demiurge. In all three cases the divine is a gift, not a natural endowment.

Eve's creation is also interpreted in terms of divine saving action (she is the spiritual woman), although she can be seen to play an anthropological role as the firstly earthly woman. But here too she is created as a device of the Demiurge to empty Adam of his divine power, or is seen as marking the separation of the original androgyne and initiating the fatal processes of generation and decay. Elements of all these ideas are present both in the Apocryphon and the Ophite system, which agree in their treatment of her.

Finally, although there are traces in the Apocryphon and the Ophite system of a three-fold division of reality into hylic, psychic and pneumatic, linked to some extent in the case of the Apocryphon with the figures of Adamas, Seth and their aeons,<sup>485</sup> the central anthropological theses of both centre round the divine elements, the power of light present in the Demiurge and transmitted by him into earthly man. In addition to his body and soul, man thus possesses the divine spark or Nous or Epinoia of light. Since the Demiurge already possesses this element in both texts the image-motif is much less important: the archons are unable either to cause heavenly Man to descend or to control the divine element when it has descended.

Notes to Chapter Three

1. Basilides in Hipp. Ref. VII 21,1-4 (Wendland 196.19 - 197.16); 27,11-12 (Wendland 207.28 - 208.4). See also W.Foerster, "Das System des Basilides", NTS 9 (1962-3), pp.233-55; Gnosis vol.I, pp.62-4.
2. E.g. in Saturninus in Iren. adv.haer. I 24,1 (Harvey I 197: body plus spark of life); the system described by Zosimus, On the Letter Omega, §12 (Scott-Ferguson, Hermetica IV, p.107: man of 4 elements plus inner spiritual man); the Poimandres, CH I 15 (mortal body and immortal inner man); and in Manicheism according to the Kephalaia LV (ed. Polotsky - Böhlig, Stuttgart 1940, pp.133f.); Theodore bar Konai, Lib.Schol. XI (ed. Pognon pp.130ff., 191-3; Adam, Texte zum Manichäismus, pp.22f.); Ibn Nadim, Fihrist (ed. Flügel, Leipzig 1862, p.101); Aug.op. imperf.c.Iul. III (P.L. XLV 1318-1327; Adam, Texte, 31-3); A Manichaeon Psalmbook, Ps.248 (ed. Allberry, Stuttgart 1938, p.56, 15-32; Adam, Texte, p.42); Serapion of Thmuis, Against the Manichees, 12 (ed. and trans. R.P. Casey, Cambridge, Mass. 1931, p.34; Adam, Texte p.59) etc. (mortal body and immortal soul).
3. E.g. in the Baruch of Justin, Hipp.Ref. V 26,7-8 (Wendland 127.28 - 128.5; body, soul and spirit); the Ophites, Iren.adv.haer. I 30, 8-9, 13-14 (Harvey I 234-6; 239-40; body, soul and spirit or trace of light); and the AJ, BG 48,14 - 55,13 and parr. (material body, soul or psychic body and light power).
4. Thus in Hippolytus' account of the Naassenes we hear both of the soul or inner man imprisoned in the earthly body (Ref. V 7,30: Wendland 85.23 - 86.10 ; 7,36 :Wendland 87.20 - 88.3), and of the three elements or types of soul in man (Ref. V 6,6-7: Wendland 78.11-21 ; 8,2-4 :Wendland 89.10-26).
5. In e.g. the Ptolemaic school of Valentinianism according to Iren. adv.haer. I 5,5-6 (Harvey I 49-51) and Exc.ex Theod. 50,1 - 52,3; 53- 55,1 (Sagnard 162-170) which speak of hylic soul, psychic soul, spiritual seed and flesh. However, only the hylic and fleshly elements are natural and naturally transmitted. The psychic and pneumatic are gifts, the former from the Demiurge, the latter from the Saviour. This Valentinian fourfold division may reflect the Platonic scheme of body plus threefold soul divided into irrational and instinctive soul, the spirited element and the immortal divine and rational soul. Cf. Timaeus 69B - 71A; 73B - D. On this see G. Quispel, "La conception de



l'homme dans la gnose valentinienne", Gnostic Studies vol. I (Istanbul, 1974), pp.48ff. But if this is one factor, more significant is the influence of Christian anthropology and the desire to adapt to it, which is particularly evident in the system of Ptolemaeus and the parallel but independent system in Exc.ex Theod. 43-65 (on this see L. Schottroff, "Animae naturaliter salvandae", BZNW 37 (1969), pp.84-97). Here the Demiurge is not the cause of, but merely the moulder of the two natural elements, flesh and hylic soul, which represent the negative side of man. He is responsible for, and the source of the psychic element, a "divine" gift, which, as the ability to choose good or evil, makes an intermediate salvation by works possible, and is thus characteristic of the orthodox Christians, and - and here the Gnostic additional element to the traditional three-fold Christian scheme of body, soul and spirit (I Thess. 5:23), or body, animal soul and rational soul or intelligence comes in - the unconscious transmitter of the spiritual element. Not all men have this, only a small minority (Exc. 56,2: Sagnard 172).

6. Iren. adv. haer. I 24,1 (Harvey I 197).
7. Ibid., I 24,2 (Harvey I 197f.).
8. Ibid.
9. CH. I 12-17.
10. OnOrWld CG II 112,25 - 113,5.
11. Cf. "On the Evangel of Seth", 2-4, in Preuschen, "Die apokryphen gnostischen Adamschriften" in Festgruss Bernhard Stade (Giessen 1900) p.199 (37); Die Schatzhöhle, ed. C. Bezold, Leipzig 1883, pp.10ff.; "The Book of the Rolls" ff. 102a-106a in Apocrypha Arabica (Studia Sinaitica, VIII) ed. M.D. Gibson, pp.18-22; The Book of Adam and Eve, trans. S.C. Malan, London 1882, pp.118-121. On this see L. Ginzberg, Legends, I pp.121ff.; V pp.149,172.
12. Pan. XXXIX 2,1-7 (Holl 2,72.16 - 73.17).
13. Cf. Ptolemaeans in Iren. adv. haer. I 6,1 (Harvey I 51f.); 7,5 (Harvey I 64ff.); Exc.ex Theod. 54,1-3 (Sagnard 170); TriTrac CG I 118, 14-23.

14. See n.4. Cf. Gnosis vol. I chs. 14 to 19, which are entitled "Systems involving Three Principles".
15. W.Bousset, Hauptprobleme der Gnosis, Göttingen 1907, ch. 4, "Der Urmensch", pp.160-220.
16. R.Reitzenstein, Poimandres, Leipzig 1904, esp.pp.101-8, 249; Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium, Bonn 1921, p.116.
17. Op.cit., p.215. See Schenke, Gott "Mensch", p.16.
18. Ibid., p.19.
19. Das ir. Erl., p.116. See Schenke, op.cit., p.20.
20. Cf. Bousset, Hauptprobleme, pp.167-70; Reitzenstein, Poimandres, pp.81ff.
21. Ibid. Reitzenstein's reconstitution of the supposed original text is on pp.83-97. On the OT quotations inhering in this original cf. Wilson, The Gnostic Problem, p.133 n.27.
22. Der Glaubende, p.18.
23. Ibid., pp.59f., where she cites the criticisms of C.Colpe, Die Religionsgeschichtliche Schule (FRLANT 78), Göttingen 1961. Cf. also Schenke, Gott "Mensch", pp.16-33; "Die neutestamentliche Christologie" in Tröger, Gnosis und neues Testament, p.210.
24. G.Quispel, "Der gnostische Anthropos und die jüdische Tradition", Eranos Jahrbuch XXII, 1953 (Zürich 1954), pp.195-234 (= Gnostic Studies I pp.173-195).
25. Ibid., pp.201f. (Gnostic Studies I p.178).
26. Ibid., p.214 (Gnostic Studies I p.188).
27. Ibid., p.197 (Gnostic Studies I p.174).
28. J.Jervell, Imago Dei: Gen. 1: 26f., im Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen (FRLANT 76), Göttingen 1960, pp.122-70, esp.pp.122f. K. Rudolph, "Ein Grundtyp gnostischer Urmensch Spekulation", ZRGG 9 (1957), pp.1-20, represents the same approach; he takes the interpretation of Gen. 1: 26 in the Apocryphon of John (the image of Primal

Man appears to archons who create man in the image, but he is incomplete and is animated from heaven) to represent the fundamental type of Gnostic anthropology, and attempts to trace the genesis and chronology of Gnosis by means of it.

29. Ibid., p.123.
30. Ibid., p.136f., n.63.
31. Ibid.
32. Ibid., pp.169f.
33. In e.g. the Apocalypse of Adam, the Sophia of Jesus Christ, the Valentinian systems (Valentinus, the Ptolemaeans, Theodotus), Zosimus, the Baruch of Justin, the Mandeans etc. None of these have the motif of a heavenly Anthropos reflected below and earthly man made in that image. However, traces of this idea may underlie the Ophite system, which has the archons create man according to the concept (excogitatio) furnished by Sophia (Iren. adv.haer. I 30,6 ; Harvey I 232); and that of Valentinus, who speaks of angels creating Adam in the name of the pre-existent heavenly Anthropos, in the context of a discussion about the fear which statues made in the name of a god cause to their makers (Frag. 1, in Clem. Alex. Strom. II 36,2-4).
34. On earthly man as a bait to trap or control heavenly Man cf. Saturninus, Iren. adv.haer. I 24,1 (Harvey I 196f.); NatArch CG II 87,20 - 88,3; OnOrWld CG II 112,25 - 113,5; AJ BG 48,8 - 49,9 and parr. On man made in the image of the Demiurge and archons cf. the Ophites, Iren. adv.haer. I 30,6 (Harvey I 232); Poimandres, CH I,16 (Nature bears 7 men in accordance with (  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$  ) the natures of the 7 Administrators, who are ambivalent, indeed hostile figures. But cf. I, 17, where Nature bears the bodies of the 7 in accordance with (  $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$  ) the form (  $\epsilon\iota\delta\omicron\varsigma$  ) of heavenly Man); Ptolemaeans, Iren. adv.haer. I 5,5 (Harvey I 49); Exc.ex Theod. 50,1-2 (Sagnard 163-4); Mandeans, R.Ginza X (Lidzbarski p.242; Foerster, Gnosis vol. II, p.198).
35. Cf. SJC BG 91,2-17; Eug CG III 75,2-12.
36. H.Jonas, Gnosis, I,3rd ed. pp.143-6; Schottroff, Der Glaubende, pp.36ff.

37. Thus Schottroff points out that whereas the soul or psychic element is an ambivalent factor in Valentinianism, and can share in an intermediate level of salvation, in the Naassene Preaching it appears to be hostile, the contribution of the anti-divine powers, Der Glaubende pp.14ff.
38. As well as Jervell's indirect testimony to this we have that of H.-M. Schenke in Der Gott "Mensch", pp.38ff. He too considers the Eikon motif with reference to Gen. 1: 26 as the fundamental element in Gnostic anthropology, but he interprets it in terms of the consubstantiality idea which his analysis of the texts reveals. Thus he interprets the Apocryphon of John as suggesting that man's being in the image of God includes his essential unity or consubstantiality. Man's essential unity consists as much in divine form (image) as in divine content (light power) (ibid., p.41). The same arguments against the primacy of the Eikon motif as we advanced against Jervell apply equally here.
39. See e.g. his Theology of the New Testament, vol. I, London 1952, pp.168, 178, 182. On this whole problem see Schottroff, "Animae nat.salv.", BZNW, 37 (1969), pp.67ff.
40. In his article "La conception de l'homme dans la gnose valentinienne" Eranos Jahrbuch XV, 1947, pp.249-286, esp. pp.274ff. (= Gnostic Studies I, p.50).
41. Schottroff, art.cit., esp. pp. 65-8, 84-97. See now E.Pagels, "The Valentinian Claim to Esoteric Exegesis of Romans as Basis for Anthropological Theory", Vig.Chr. 26 (1972), pp.241-58, for a critique of the debate between Bultmann and Schottroff.
42. We accept the strictures of Schottroff, Der Glaubende, p.35, that a relative dating of systems cannot yet be carried out on the basis of the comparison of motifs except where a literary relationship is present, as between Iren. I 29 and the Apocryphon. Our thesis is that there is such a relationship, both literary and theological, not only between Iren. I 29 and the Apocryphon, but also, more distantly, between Iren. I 30 and the Apocryphon and other related texts, and that the differences can be explained on theological grounds and attributed to certain developing tendencies and the introduction of new motifs which can be tentatively dated by comparison with external data from contemporary orthodox Christianity, Manicheism, Judaism and pagan philosophy, especially Middle and Neo-Platonism.

43. Op.cit., Part I, chs. 1-3.
44. Iren. adv.haer. I 30,8 (Harvey I 234); Schottroff, op.cit., pp.78,82,98.
45. "Der gnostische Anthropos", pp.197, 201f. (= Gnostic Studies I, pp.174, 178f.).
46. "Ein Grundtyp", p.1f. Schenke, Der Gott "Mensch", also begins his analysis of the ancient texts with the Apocryphon.
47. Cf. e.g. Iren. adv.haer. I 5,4 (Harvey I 47); 29,4 (Harvey I 226); 30,6 (Harvey I 232); Hipp.Ref. V 26,15 (Wendland 129.9); VI 33 (Wendland 162.9); VII 25,3 (Wendland 203.5f.); Epiph. Pan.XXV 2,3 (Holl 1,269.7ff.); AJ BG 44,14f. and parr.; NatArch CG II 86,30f.; 94,21f.; 95,5; OnOrWld CG II 103, 11-13; 107, 30f.; GEgypt CG III 58,24-6; GrSeth CG VII 53,30f.; 64,19-26. See on this Schottroff, Der Glaubende, p.50 n.1.
48. See preceding note. Cf. The Testimony of Truth (TestTr) CG IX 48,4-7 which also puts Exod. 20:5 into the mouth of the Demiurge, but does not mention his claim to be the only God.
49. Iren. adv.haer. I 30,6 (Harvey I 232) has the Mother (Sophia) cry out against Ialdabaoth's boast: "Do not lie, Ialdabaoth: for there is above you the Father of All, First Man and Man, Son of Man". GEgypt CG III 59,1-4 has an anonymous voice come from on high saying: "The Man exists and the Son of Man (  $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\omicron\tau\iota \bar{\nu}\epsilon\iota \pi\rho\omega\mu\epsilon \bar{\mu}\bar{\nu} \pi\omega\eta\rho\epsilon \bar{\nu}\pi\rho\omega\mu\epsilon$  )". OnOrWld CG II 103,15-24 has Pistis Sophia, who was ultimately responsible for the origin of Ialdabaoth, cry out unseen in anger at his impiety: "You are wrong, Samael ..... an immortal light-Man exists before you, who will be revealed in your creations". NatArch CG II 87,1-4 has an anonymous voice come from Imperishability saying: "You are wrong Samael ....", 94,23-6 repeats this formula but has the voice come from the heavenly height (  $\alpha\upsilon\theta\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  ), and 95,5-8 identifies the speaker as Zoe, the daughter of Pistis Sophia, and has her say: "You are wrong, Sakla .....". Later on (96,33f.) there is a reference to the true or perfect Man coming in creaturely form.
50. BG 47,14-16; CG III 21,16-18; CG II 14,13-15; CG IV 23,15-18. All four texts appear to be identical (although CG III and CG IV are damaged) in reading  $\epsilon\upsilon\chi\omicron\tau\iota \bar{\nu}\epsilon\iota \pi\rho\omega\mu\epsilon \delta\gamma\omega \pi\omega\eta\rho\epsilon \bar{\mu}\pi\rho\omega\mu\epsilon$ .



The mention in the long recension that the voice came from the exalted aeon-heaven may represent another example of its tendency to give a more spiritual or sublime interpretation which emphasizes the ignorance of Ialdabaoth and his distance from the heavenly world. The motif of the heavenly voice, the bath qol of Jewish, and particularly rabbinic sources (see on this G.F. Moore, Judaism vol. I, Cambridge, Mass. 1950, pp.421f.), can be used by the Gnostics in a cosmogonical context, to explain how a primal mixture of light and darkness occurred, as e.g. in NatArch CG II 94,23ff., or in a Christological context, as e.g. in GrSeth CG VII 51,20 - 54,16 where Jesus' laugh of joy at the boast of Ialdabaoth resulting from Jesus' apparent death leads the latter to retort "Who (or what) is man?". However, its most natural and probably original context is anthropogonical, since the consistent form of the Demiurge's boast: "there is no other (god) apart from me", requires the appearance of a pre-existing divine being to refute him.

51. BG 47,14-16; CG III 21,18-21; CG II 14,15-18; CG IV 22,18-23. The short recension has the voice come to Sophia, which would explain why any reference to Ialdabaoth lying or being in error is missing. Janssens' explanation (Muséon 84 (1971), p.409) that the heavenly voice is to encourage Sophia only shows how artificial the Apocryphon's present scheme is, since her consort, First Man, according to Janssens, has just descended to her. The long recension, perhaps aware of the awkwardness of this, perhaps to dissociate her further from any share in redemption, has omitted any mention of the voice coming to her. That Ialdabaoth did not recognise where the voice came from (CG II 14,18; IV 22,22f.), of which there appears to be no trace in the fragmentary and confused short recension, may be a further attempt by the long recension to emphasize the ignorance of Ialdabaoth.
52. Der Glaubende, pp. 22,79.
53. CG II 14,15 - 18. BG 47,20 and CG III 21,21 have a lacuna at this point.
54. GEgypt CG III 59,1f. simply speaks of a voice coming from above (cf. AJ CG II 14,13; IV 22,15f.) with no further identification apart from the fact that the image which appears simultaneously and descends is said to be like the heavenly voice. To make sense of the passage one has to infer the course of events found e.g. in the Apocryphon: the heavenly voice and the (male?) image corresponding to it which the archons see and imitate.

55. AJ BG 47,14f.; CG III 21,17f.; CG II 14,14f.; CG IV 22,17f. (ϣωοοτ̄ ἡ̄ι πρωμε δ̄γω πω η̄ρε ἡ̄πρωμε); GEgypt CG III 59,2f. (ϣωοοτ̄ ἡ̄ι πρωμε ἡ̄πρωμε). This suggests the Greek: ἐστὶν <δ> ἄνθρωπος καὶ <ε> υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου.
56. Iren. adv. haer. I 30,6 (Harvey I 232).
57. Harvey supplies καὶ ἄνθρωπος to correspond to the Latin.
58. OnOrWld CG II 103,19f.
59. F.H. Borsch, The Christian and Gnostic Son of Man (Studies in Biblical Theology, 2nd series, 14), London 1970, p.107.
60. Ibid.
61. Ibid., n.185. Unfortunately Borsch does not suggest what the variants might have been or what the original statement might have read.
62. Ibid. Borsch cites the Naassene presentation of Man and Son of Man as one being according to Hipp. Ref. X 9, 1 (Wendland 268.12f.) in support of this.
63. AJ BG 47,1-14; CG III 21,21-22,6; CG II 14,18 - 15,4; CG IV 22,23 - 23,20; OnOrWld CG II 103,28-32 (the appearance of Sophia; cf. 107,17 - 108,31, the appearance of light and Light-Adam); 112,25 - 113,12 (Light-Adam is seen by the archons who decide to create earthly man in the divine image); GEgypt CG III 59,4-10 (see n. 54 above). Cf. NatArch CG II 87,11-33 which follows the Great Archon's blasphemy and the reproof from heaven with the appearance of a female being, Imperishability, whose image is seen in the waters and copied by the archons.
64. Iren. adv. haer. I 30,6 (Harvey I 232); "sex autem virtutes audientes haec, matre dante illis excogitationem hominis ..... formaverunt hominem".
65. I 30, 1 (Harvey I 226f.).
66. I 30, 13 (Harvey I 239).
67. Cf. I 30,11-13 (Harvey I 237-9).



68. I 30,1 (Harvey I 227).
69. I 30, 2-5 (Harvey I 227-31),
70. Op.cit., p.61.
71. Eug CG III 74,19 - 75,9 (cf. SJC BG 90,15 - 91,13; CG III 98,22 - 99,10).
72. CG III 76,13 - 77,4 (cf. SJC BG 93,18 - 94,11; CG III 100,21 - 101, 8). The process is obscure but appears to involve the Father mentally conceiving (νοεῖν) the Archē (i.e. the Forefather?) and his image becoming a strong power. As a result the Archē of that light (the light being the Father who is perfect in light?) revealed an immortal Man, or, as in SJC CG III 101,7f., appeared as an immortal Man. SJC BG 94,7-11 reads "the light of that ἀρχή appeared in a first immortal man". This appears to echo the emanation of divine beings by the hypostatisation of mental conceptions as with the Ophites of Irenaeus.
73. SJC BG 98,18 - 99,14; CG III 104,10-20. Eug CG III has two pages missing at this point and CG V 8,26ff. is very fragmentary. However a careful comparison of Eug CG V 8,27ff. and SJC BG 98,16ff. suggests that Eug also envisages the appearance of a female being ([ἀρ]χή? CG V 8,28) from the immortal Man who then, as in SJC, agrees with his consort and produces Son of Man.
74. Eug CG III 81,21 - 82,6 (cf. SJC BG 102,15 - 103,9; CG III 106,15-24). The continuation in SJC furthers the parallel with Iren. I 30 in that the figure of Pistis Sophia in the former, like Sophia Prunicus in the latter, is responsible for sending those who come into this world as drops of light into the realm of the Demiurge, the Pantocrator. (Cf. the trace of light motif in Iren. I 30).
75. M.Krause, "Das literarische Verhältnis des Eugnostosbriefes zur Sophia Jesu Christi", Mullus: Festschrift Theodor Klauser (Jahrbuch für Antike und Christentum, Ergänzungsband 1), Münster 1964, pp.215-23, against Schenke, "Nag-Hamadi Studien. II; Das System der Sophia Jesu Christi", ZRGG 14 (1962) pp.262-6, who argued that the SJC was the source for Eugnostos. See Wilson, Gnosis, pp.111-17.

76. Thus the SJC, by identifying the Son of Man, the first begotten Son not only as Christ (cf. SJC BG 99,7-9.14-16 = CG III 104,20-2) but as the Saviour, (the name of the son of the Son of Man in Eug CG III 81,21 - 82,3) in the first aeon (cf. SJC BG 108,1-7) has reversed the order of aeons in Eug CG III 85,9-15 and omitted the third aeon which is that of the Saviour, the son of the Son of Man (cf. Eug CG V 13,12f.).
77. The argument of G.C. Stead in "The Valentinian Myth of Sophia", JTS n.s. 20(1969)pp.97f. that the peculiarity of the Ophite theology in having the Ennoia become the Son of Man and unite with the Father, Man, to produce Christ has resulted from the amalgamation of two systems, one which had God and his Son, Ennoia (or Logos?) who imitates him, the other which has God, his consort-Spirit and his Son Christ, although attractive, does not do justice (a) to the fact that God's Ennoia is surely female and (b) that she is not equated with the Holy Spirit who is a distinct subordinate figure, not apparently equivalent to God's consort-Spirit.
78. Heracleon's distinction between the Son of Man above the "Place" who sows (i.e. has a creative role) and the Saviour who is also Son of Man (frag. 35 on Jn. 4:37 in Orig. Comm. in Joh. XIII,49) may be an echo of the Ophite conception of Son of Man and his son, Christ, as (son of) Son of Man. Mt. 13: 37 on the Son of Man sowing may have also had some influence on this interpretation.
79. SJC BG 98,7-13; CG III 103,22 - 104,4.
80. Eug CG V 8,27 - 9,9.
81. SJC BG 99,8f. CG III 104,15f. omits this.
82. BG 99,15f.; CG III 104,21f. Cf. Eug CG V 9,7.
83. Op.cit., p.100.
84. Ibid. n.159.
85. Borsch, op.cit., p.62, notes that C.Colpe, "New Testament and Gnostic Christology" in Religions in Antiquity, Leiden 1968, pp.227ff., and esp. 238f., believes that all Gnostic occurrences of the title are traceable to Christian influence.
86. Ibid., pp.61, 78ff., 98.

87. GPh CG II 63,29f. As Borsch notes (*ibid.*, p.78) the second "Son of" (  $\pi\omega\upsilon\iota\acute{\rho}\epsilon$  ) is marked for cancellation, but he refers to the fact that "the son of the Son of Man" occurs twice in saying 120 and in a version of Eugnostos, and to the idea of "the seed of the Son of Man" in saying 102 as support for retaining the usage. The redactor may have been influenced by Christian usage and by the oddness of the phrase. (*Lectio difficilior?*). However, R.McL. Wilson (*The Gospel of Philip*, London 1962, p.115) and J.E. Ménard (*L'Évangile selon Philippe*, Paris 1967, p.70) argue that "son of the Son of Man" is a ditto-graphy and to be rejected. The idea of the seed of Seth, the son of the heavenly Adam, occurs in AJ BG 36,3f.; CG III 13,21; CG II 9,15. Cf. GEgypt CG III 54,10; 65,19f.; CG IV 77,18; Zostrianos (Zostr) CG VIII 30,9-14.
88. As do W.C. Till (*Das Evangelium nach Philippos*, Berlin 1963) and Ménard (*op.cit.*, p.170). But, as Wilson (*op.cit.*, pp.114f.) points out, any restoration must remain highly conjectural.
89. *Op.cit.*, p.79.
90. GPh CG II 75,25 - 76,4.
91. Cf. saying 82 (CG II 71,4) which is also concerned with the bridal chamber and Jesus. Eug has "Father of the All" (CG III 73,2f.); "Man" (CG III 76,23); "Son of Man" (CG III 81,13) and "son of Son of Man" (CG V 13,12f.). The restoration  $\pi\omega\upsilon\iota\acute{\rho}\epsilon$  seems to be ruled out since there is no trace of the superscript line which always marks the abbreviation  $\pi\omega\upsilon\iota\acute{\rho}\epsilon$ .
92. *Ibid.*, p.80.
93. See n.87.
94. GPh CG II 81,14-21. On the opening phrase,  $\epsilon\upsilon\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\epsilon\ \bar{\nu}\epsilon\iota\ \pi\omega\upsilon\iota\acute{\rho}\epsilon$   $\bar{\mu}\pi\ \rho\omega\mu\epsilon$  cf. n.55.
95. *Ibid.*, pp.81f.
96. Intriguingly, orthodox Christians like Athanasius in his attack on the Arians in the mid 4th century could insist on the same distinction between creation and begetting; Christ is Son of God by nature, as his only begotten, whereas men are creatures and are made sons of God by grace and adoption. Cf. his *de Synodis* 36: "If Son not a creature, if a creature then not a Son!"

97. Hipp.Ref. VIII 12,1 - 13,4 (Wendland 232.4 - 233.19). Cf. X 17,1-5 (Wendland 278.16 - 279.5). On this see Borsch,op.cit., pp.66-72.
98. VIII 12,2 (Wendland 232.7f.).
99. VIII 12,5 (Wendland 232.15ff.).
100. VIII 12,7 (Wendland 232.26).
101. VIII 12,2 (Wendland 232.8-10).
102. VIII 13,3-4 (Wendland 233.7-16). Cf. X 17,1 (Wendland 278.16-19).
103. VIII 12,7-13,1 (Wendland 232.20 - 233.3). Cf. X 17,2 (Wendland 278.19-22).
104. VIII 13,4 (Wendland 233.16-19), Cf. X 17,2 (Wendland 278.22 - 279.2).
105. VIII 13,2 (Wendland 233.4f.). Wendland, followed by Borsch (op.cit.p.66f.), suggests that this is a combination of Col. 1:19 and 2: 9. Borsch also points to the  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\kappa\omega\iota$  and  $\epsilon\upsilon\delta\acute{o}\kappa\eta\sigma\alpha$  of Lk. 3: 22 in the context of Jesus' baptism or birth as the "Son". Both the Lukan, Markan and Matthean texts on the baptism of Christ and the passage in Hebrews on the superiority of God's son (1: 1-2: 9) allude to Ps. 2: 7:  $\Upsilon\acute{\iota}\omicron\varsigma\ \mu\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\acute{\iota}\ \sigma\upsilon$ . Furthermore, the evangelists attribute it to a heavenly voice. Does this cast light on the heavenly reproof, "Man exists and the Son of Man" in the Gnostic texts in the context of the creation of earthly man, and even suggest one source of the motif? See further below.
106. On the timeless generation of the Son and the analogy of light and its radiance cf. Origen, de princ. I, 2.7,11. It is perhaps worth noting that Origen is deriving his ideas from Heb. 1: 3 and Wisd. 7:25. On the analogy of light and fire cf. Athenagoras, Leg. 24,2.
107. Op.cit., p.70.
108. Hipp. Ref. V 6,3-11,1(Wendland 77.26 - 104,5).

109. V 6,4 (Wendland 78,5f.  $\xi\upsilon\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\nu\ \iota\kappa\omega\iota\ \upsilon\varsigma\iota\ \xi\upsilon\theta\rho\omega\pi\omicron\nu$  ).
110. X 9,1 (Wendland 268.12f.). This passage also makes clear what appears to be omitted in V 6,4; that Man, Son of Man is the originator ( $\xi\rho\chi\iota$ ) of the universe. Cf. the view of Monoimus in n.102.
111. V 6,5 (Wendland 78.7f.).
112. V 6,5 (Wendland 78.9f.); cf. VIII 12,5 (Wendland 232.19f.).
113. V 6,6 (Wendland 78.13-15); 8,38 (Wendland 96.7f.). Cf. X 9,2 (Wendland 268.15f.).
114. V 7,23 (Wendland 84.9).
115. V 7,25 (Wendland 84.17f.).
116. V 8,14 (Wendland 91.24f.); 8,21 (Wendland 93.3).
117. V 9,1 (Wendland 97.24 - 98.3).
118. V 7,6 (Wendland 80.7f.).
119. V 7,7 (Wendland 80.13); 7,8 (Wendland 80.17).
120. V 7,30f. (Wendland 86.1-11). The figure of the Demiurge clearly reflects El Shaddai, the Creator God of the Old Testament.
121. V 7,35f. (Wendland 87.18 - 88,3).
122. V 8,9-10 (Wendland 90.25 - 91.5).
123. V 7,29f. (Wendland 85.18 - 86.1); 8,4f. (Wendland 89.22 - 90.1); 9,2 (Wendland 98.6-8).
124. V 7,33 (Wendland 87.4-6). Such language may well reflect Heb.1: 3, the son of God as the  $\chi\upsilon\tau\alpha\kappa\tau\eta\rho\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\omega\varsigma$   $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$  just as the whole underlying theme of the regeneration of the spiritual men in the image of, or so as to be consubstantial with, the Son of Man may reflect the picture Hebrews presents of God begetting his son as his creative agent, and the latter's humiliation and exaltation as our pioneer.
125. V 8,13-15 (Wendland 91.17 - 92.6).

126. V 8,40 (Wendland 96.12-14). On the title  $\phi\omega\sigma\tau\eta\rho$  cf. ApocAd CG V 75,14f.; 76,9.28; 77,15; 82,7.28; 85,28.
127. See n.21.
128. V 7,2 (Wendland 79.7-10).
129. V 8,2 (Wendland 89.10f.); 8,41 (Wendland 96.21f.).
130. V 7,36 (Wendland 87.20 - 88.2).
131. V 7,6 (Wendland 80.7f.); 8,10 (Wendland 91.4f.).
132. Cf. V 7, 35-6 (Wendland 87.15 - 88.3) which illustrates the  $\pi\epsilon\tau\rho\eta$  of Homer, Odyssey XXIV, 8 by a reference to Adamas as the corner stone laid down (Is. 28: 16; Ps.118(117): 22, cf. Mt. 21:42), which the text applies to the inner man, Adamas, from the Primal Man Adamas "cut out without hands" (Dan. 2: 45 LXX), also alluding to 2 Cor. 4: 7 ( $\delta\sigma\tau\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\iota\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon$ ). This passage, with the omission of a reference to Eph. 3: 15, is retained in Reitzenstein's reconstruction of the supposed non-Christian original (Poimandres, p.89). However, it is important to note that the texts from Isaiah, Psalm 118(117) and Daniel were all interpreted Christologically from New Testament times on. Thus Mk. 12:10 cites Ps.118(117): 22f., I Peter 2: 6-8 has Is. 28:16 split by Ps.118: 22f., and Lk.20:18 suggests that the author equated the rejected stone of Ps.118:22 with the stone of Dan.2: 34. See on this C.H. Dodd, According to the Scriptures, London 1952, pp.35f., 41-3; 69,99f., 107f., 138. He argues (ibid., p.100) that Pss. 118,8 and Is. 28: 16 "appear to have been associated at a very early stage as symbolic of the coming of Christ and its effects". The reference to Dan. 2 he thinks probably belongs to a later stage of reflection (ibid., p.69). Is. 28: 16 and Dan. 2: 34,45 occur together in Barn. 6,2-4; Just. Mart. Dial. 114; Iren. adv.haer. III 21,7 (Harvey II p.118), and all 3 occur together in Acta Petri, 24 (Lipsius - Bonnet, Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha, I, p.72.8-11); Tert. adv.Iud. 14, 2f.; Cypr. Testim. adv. Iud. II, 16-17 (CSEL III i, 82.4 - 84,5) etc. This suggests that it is at least as likely, if not more likely, that the Naassenes applied an existing cluster of proof texts on Christ as the "stone" to Adamas than that Christians from New Testament times on borrowed such a cluster assembled by Gnostics to refer to heavenly Adamas.



133. Borsch, op.cit., p.74, detects behind the Naassene lore a similar conception of a man-like hero, based on earlier mythologies, who must suffer (through water) before rising to glory. Such a view, he argues, was probably a sectarian Jewish parallel to ideas which affected Christian beginnings. However, he fails to note the links between Hebrews 1 and 2, Monoimus and the Naassenes.
  
134. GEgypt CG III 49,8-10; CG IV 61,10f. The latter appears to describe him as "the eye of the [light?]", cf. SJC BG 108,10f. which refers to the Man, Adam, by this title. Böhlig (Das Ägypterevangelium von Nag Hammadi: Göttinger Orientforschungen, VI Reihe: Hellenistica, Band I, Wiesbaden, 1974, p.80 n.22) notes the probably intentional play on words in the underlying Greek - φῶς, light and ἄνθρωπος, man. Could the idea of the heavenly Light-Adam of OnOrWld and this text derive from a Gnostic interpretation of Gen. 1: 3: καὶ εἶπεν ὁ Θεός, γενήτω φῶς ? Zosimus, On the Letter Omega, §11 (Scott-Ferguson Hermetica IV, p.107.7-11), records that the inner spiritual man has two names, the secret and the common. His common name is φῶς, hence men are called φῶτες. Could his secret name known only to Nicotheos have been "Adamas"?
  
135. CG III 49,9f.
  
136. CG IV 61,11.
  
137. CG III 49,10-12; CG IV 61,12-14. An echo of Jn. 1: 3?
  
138. CG III 49,13-16.
  
139. CG III 50,20f.; 51,5f.; 55,17; 65,15. Cf. CG IV 77,11f.
  
140. CG III 51,5-12; CG IV 62,30 - 63,16; CG III 55,16-18; CG IV 67,2f. On the idea of the seed of Seth or of the Son of Man cf. GEgypt CG III 54,10f.; 65,19f. (= CG IV 76,13ff.); AJ BG 36,3f.; CG III 13,21; CG II 9,15; GPh CG II 76,2f. (saying 102). The last passage continues with a reference to the true race (γένος). See n.87. On Seth as the father of the immoveable race cf. GEgypt CG III 59,13ff.; 3StSeth CG VII 118,12f. On the Son of Man sowing his seed in the world cf. Heracleon frag.35 in Orig. Comm. in Joh. XIII 49.
  
141. CG III 60,9-11; CG IV 71,18ff.



142. CG III 62,12-24; CG IV 73,25 - 74,9. On the Watchers cf. I Enoch 1,5 and Charles, Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O.T. vol II, Oxford 1963, Index s.v. Watchers.
143. CG III 63,4-8; CG IV 74,17-22. On the three advents of the Saviour cf. AJ CG II 30,32-31,1; CG IV 47,23 - 48,1; ApocAd CG V 76,8-27.
144. CG III 63,8-13; CG IV 74,23-9.
145. CG III 63,13-64,3; CG IV 74,29 - 75,17.
146. Iren. adv.haer. I 30,11 (Harvey I 237f.). Could this be an allusion to passages like Ps. 8: 5 which could be readily interpreted by Gnostics as referring to the heavenly figures of Man and Son of Man and the temporary "humiliation" of the latter?
147. I 30,11f. (Harvey I 238).
148. Ibid. The figure of Metanoia in GEgypt CG III 59,9-12 appears to correspond, in some degree, to that of Sophia Prunicus in Iren. I 30.
149. I 30,14 (Harvey I 239).
150. However, we have attempted to demonstrate the close similarity between the figure of Christ, the 3rd male, the son of (Man and) Son of Man of Irenaeus' account, and Seth, the son of Adamas in the Gospel of the Egyptians. Indeed, Seth can be described as the son of the Son of Man, since, according to CG III 49,9f., Adamas derives from the First Man, and is thus the Son of Man. As Böhlig points out (Das Ägypterevangelium, p.82 n.23), for the Sethians Adamas was the third Person of the Trinity of Father, Mother and Son. Cf. 3StSeth CG VII (5) passim, in which Seth praises in ascending order his father Adamas (i.e. the Son), Barbelo (the Mother) and the totally transcendent Father. The Naassenes, too, can entitle Adamas both Man and Son of Man. See n.110.
151. I 29,3 (Harvey I 223f.). Although the figure of Autogenes in the Gospel of the Egyptians is not directly responsible for the production of Adamas, he is associated with him, cf. GEgypt CG III 49,16-22; CG IV 61,18-23.
152. AJ BG 34,19 - 35,9; CG III 12,24 - 13,8; CG II 8,28 - 9,2. See above. p. 99.

153. Iren.adv.haer. I 29,3 (Harvey I 224). Is this perhaps an explanation of the origin of the heavenly prototype of the tree of knowledge of the earthly garden, in accordance with the Platonising tendency of much Gnostic theology? Cf. OnOrWld CG II 116, 25-32 which has Eve, the daughter of Sophia Zoe, the spiritual woman, consort and original of earthly Adam, who is her image (  $\epsilon\iota\omega\epsilon$  ), enter and become the three of knowledge.
154. BG 35,20 - 36,7; CG III 13,17 - 14,1; CG II 9,11-16.
155. BG 47,20 - 48,5; CG III 21,21-4; CG II 14,18-24; CG IV 22,23 - 23,2.
156. Art.cit., p.409. Cf. also pp.62f. on BG 37,3-6.
157. BG 27,17 - 28,4; CG III 7,22 - 8,5; CG II 5,4-10; CG IV 7,20-27; Janssens, art.cit., pp.44f. The title "Metropator" for this figure in CG II 5,6f. also occurs in the passage on the image, CG II 14,19, which would tend to confirm Janssens' identification. On Metropator see above, p.49 n.82. Janssens (ibid., pp.45f.) points out that the combination of triple male and androgyne as well as the primal triad Father - Mother - Son is found in the Naassene system. On man as triple cf. Hipp. Ref. V 6,6 (Wendland 78.11ff.); 8,1-5 (Wendland 89.9 - 90.2); on him as bisexual cf. Ref. V 6,5 (Wendland 78.7); 7,14f. (Wendland 82.4, 9f.); 8,4 (Wendland 89.23). The Metropator of CG II's version of the Apocryphon may find an echo in the formula of the Naassenes and Monoimus in which Man is addressed by the two immortal names  $\pi\alpha\tau\eta\rho$  .....  $\mu\eta\tau\eta\rho$  . See n. 112.
158. Cf. BG 30 and Janssens, art.cit., pp.49-54.
159. Giversen, Apocryphon, p.239f. Cf. CG II 5,6ff.; 14,19ff.
160. CG II 6,15f.; CG IV 9,19.
161. Ibid., p.240. Cf. BG 51,1-17 and parr.; 57,20 - 58,1 and parr.; 63,14 - 64,13 and parr.; 75,10-13; CG II 30,11 - 31,25. However, just as important a saviour-figure in the Apocryphon, if not more so, is the Epinoia of light. Cf. BG 53,4 - 54,5 and parr.; 57,8-19 and parr.; 59,6-12 and parr.; 60,16 - 61,7 and parr.

162. BG 36,2-7; CG III 13,19 - 14,1; CG II 9,14-17. Cf. Eug CG III 85,9-14; CG V 13,4 -14; SJC BG 108,1-11. Underlying the texts appears to be the scheme of three aeons, the 1st that of Adam, "the eye of the light", the 2nd that of the Son of Man, the 3rd that of the son of the Son of Man.
163. BG 36,7-15; CG III 14,1-9; CG II 9,18-24.
164. Cf. GEgypt CG III 65,12-22; CG IV 77,7-19; CG III 56,17-22; CG IV 67,27-68,5. See Böhlig, Ägypterevangelium, p.108 n.55.
165. See n.143.
166. AJ BG 51,8 - 52,15 and parr.
167. Cf. AJ BG 51,8ff.; the Autogenes is dispatched with the four lights to rescue the light power; GEgypt CG III 62,24 - 63,4; CG IV 74,9-17; Seth is sent from the four lights according to the will of the Autogenes, with the 5 seals. Cf. the role of the five sons of the Living Spirit in Manicheism according to Theodore bar Konai, Lib.Schol. XI (Pognon 128,186f.; Adam, Texte 17f.).
168. AJ CG II 30,11 - 31,25; CG IV 46,38 - 49,6; GEgypt CG III 63,4ff.; CG IV 74,17ff. Cf. the figure of the Illuminator in ApocAd CG V 76,8 -27.
169. AJ CG II 31,22-5; CG IV 49,1-6; GEgypt CG III 62,24 - 63,4; CG IV 74,9-17. Cf. the activity of the Illuminator in ApocAd CG V 76,28 - 77,3.
170. Cf. Iren. adv.haer. I 29,1-2 (Harvey I 222f.) and GEgypt CG IV 59,29 - 60,10.
171. From the fact that the heavenly voice in Iren. adv.haer. I 30,6 speaks of Man, Son of Man, and that Christ can be called Son of Man both as son of Man, Son of Man, and as son of First Man (cf. I 30,13) one could argue a correspondence here between Ennoia/Man (Son of Man) and Christ in Iren. I 30 and androgynous Barbelo/First Man and her son, Christ in the Apocryphon. In any case, whatever the differences in detail between the systems, in both, alongside the figures of the Mother and Sophia, First Man and Christ play a central role in the creation and salvation of man. Cf. Iren. adv.haer. I 30,6 (Harvey I 233: Adam, in-breathed with the breath of life thanks First Man); 30,11 (Harvey I 237f.: Sophia speaks through the prophets about the First Man

and Christ); 30,12 (Harvey I 238: the Mother, First Woman, asks First Man to send Christ to aid Sophia and rescue the trace of light); 30,13 (Harvey I 239: Christ proclaims the Unknown Father and himself as son of the First Man); BG 47,20 - 48,5 (the Father, the First Man, in the form of a man, reveals himself to the archons); 51,2-14 (at Sophia's request, the Father of the All sends the Autogenes (i.e. Christ) and the four lights to bring the power of the Mother out of Ialdabaoth); 71,10-13 (a reference to the men of the race of the perfect eternal Man of light, i.e. the First Man or Christ? cf. BG 27,5 - 28,4; 30,1-19); CG II 30,11 - 31,25 (the triple parousia of the Saviour). The parallel to BG 47,20ff. in the long recension (CG II 14,18-24; CG IV 22,23 - 23,2) appears to identify First Man with the Metropator and the Pronoia, the image of the invisible, i.e. Barbelo (cf. CG II 4,26 - 5,11) much more explicitly than the short recension. This is probably a further example of the tendency of the long to a more spiritual interpretation: thus it is not the Father of the All, the original First Man who appears, as the short recension could be taken to suggest, but Barbelo, the image of the invisible, in a man-like form.

172. Cf. adv.haer. I 30,12 (Harvey I 238). On the Apocryphon see n.161. However, as suggested above, Sophia in the Ophite system and the Epinoia in the Apocryphon are given greater prominence as saviour-figures than the Mother, or even Christ, although, of course, the work of the former two could be said to be merely preparatory.
173. Cf. Böhlig-Wisse, The Gospel of the Egyptians, p.185, who see the "Man" and "Son of Man" as part of traditional material not further integrated into the cosmogony of the tractate.
174. C.H. Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, London 1935 (1954<sup>2</sup>), p.146 n.1.
175. H.-M. Schenke, "Nag Hamadi Studien III: Die Spitze des dem Apokryphon Johannis und der Sophia Jesu Christi zugrundeliegenden gnostischen Systems", ZRGG 14 (1962), pp.355-61.
176. Adv.haer. I 29,1 (Harvey I 222); 29,3 (Harvey I 224).
177. BG 35,13-20; CG III 13,11-17; CG II 9,5-11.

178. CG III 41,7-12; CG IV 50,23 - 51,2; CG III 41,23 - 42,4; CG IV 51,15-22.
179. On the glory of Adam, lost at the fall cf. Schatzhöhle, pp.3f.; Book of the Rolls, pp.6f.; "Account of the Creation and Fall of Adam", 7-9, in Preuschen, Adamschriften, pp.190f. (28f.); "Words of Adam to Seth", 1,5, ibid., p.208f. (46f.); Book of Adam and Eve, pp.3, 8, 10 and passim. Cf. ApocAd CG V 64,6 - 65,9; Apoc. Mos. xxi,6. On Adam exalted to Paradise till the last Day cf. Apoc. Mos. xxxvii - xxxix; Tert. de paen. 12,9. On the glorification of Seth and the superiority of his offspring cf. Schatzhöhle, p.10; Book of the Rolls, pp.12,18f.; George Cedrenus, Hist. Comp. (P.G.CXXI40B - 41A) etc.
180. On the glory of Adam cf. b. Baba Bathra 58a; Pesikta de Rab Kahana 4,4; Pesikta Rabbati 14,10; Lev. R. XX, 2; Eccl. R. VIII,1; on the loss of his lustre as a result of his transgression cf. Gen. R. XI,2; XII,6; Num. R. XIII 12. Cf. Philo, de virt. 203-5. See also Strack - Billerbeck IV, 2 pp.887; L. Ginzberg, "Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern u.a.", Monatschrift für Geschichte u. Wissenschaft des Judentums, 1899 - 1900, pp.33f.; B. Murmelstein, "Adam; ein Beitrag zur Messiaslehre", WZKM 35 (1928), p.255 n.3. On the glorification of Seth cf. PRE 22; Gen. R. XXIII,5; Ginzberg, Legends I, p.121; V, p.149. Cf. Philo's view of Seth as a pattern of virtue, post. 42f., 170f., 173. However, the last passage makes clear his earthly status.
181. "Der gnostische Anthropos", p.216 (= Gnostic Studies, I p.189).
182. See n.134 above on Gen. 1:3 and the play on  $\phi\omega\varsigma$  /  $\phi\omega\varsigma$ . Thus, in Poimandres CH I 12,17, Anthropos, the son of the supreme Father, Nous, who is  $\xi\omega\gamma$  and  $\phi\omega\varsigma$  is equally  $\xi\omega\gamma$  and  $\phi\omega\varsigma$ ; in Zos. On the Letter Omega, §11 (Scott-Ferguson Hermetica IV p.107) the inner spiritual man's common name is  $\phi\omega\varsigma$ . The heavenly Adam of GEgypt CG III 49,8-10; CG IV 61,8f. is also described as illuminating light (or light from light?), and SJC BG 100,14; 108,10f.; CG III 105,12f. as well as GEgypt CG IV 61,10f. describe him as "the eye of the light" (cf. Eug CG III 81,2). OnOrWld CG III 108,2-21; 112,10 - 113,10 treats of the appearance of light, in which is the image of a man, Light-Adam, whose appearance to the archons of Ialdabaoth initiates the creation of earthly Adam, and AJ BG 49,6-9 has the archons call their creature "Adam" that the name and power (of the heavenly Man?) be a light for them. This too suggests both that the image seen is that of heavenly Adam(as) and that he is a light-being. Finally, the Untitled Text in the Bruce Codex (Schmidt-MacDermot 252.8-10) speaks of twelve precious stones ( $\epsilon\delta\gamma\mu\alpha\tau\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ) from Adamas the light-Man. Cf. the Manichean Light-Adamas in Kephalaia LXX (Polotsky-Böhlig 172) etc.



183. On the heavenly Anthropos as bisexual in Gnostic systems cf. the Naassenes in Hipp.Ref. V 6,5 (Wendland 78.7f.); Poimandres CH I 15.18; AJ BG 28,3; CG III 8,4 (Barbelo); Eug CG III 76,23f. = SJC BG 94,9-11; CG III 101,7f.; Ptolemaeans in Iren. adv. haer. I 1,1 (Harvey I p.10); OnOrWld CG II 113,21-35 (Hermaphrodites). On the ideal man as neither male nor female, i.e. bisexual, cf. Philo, de opif. 134; on the rabbinic view of Adam as having two faces (i.e. being a hermaphrodite) cf. Gen.R. VIII,1; XVII,6; b Ber. 61a; b Erub. 18a; Lev.R. XIV; Jervell, Imago, pp.107-112; Ginzberg, Legends, V, pp.88f.
184. Cf. Philo, de opif. 134; quaest. in Gen. I,4; leg. all. I,31; her. 56f. Cf. Ginzberg, Legends, ibid. On Philo's distinction between the ideal man of Gen. 1: 26 and the earthly man of Gen. 2: 7 see A.J.M. Wedderburn, "Philo's Heavenly Man", Novum Testamentum 15 (1973), pp.301-326, esp. 306-15. Some followers of the Valentinian Marcus, according to Iren. adv. haer. I 18,2 (Harvey I 172), echo Philo's distinction exactly, interpreting the (earthly) man of Gen. 1: 26f. as masculine-feminine and spiritual in contrast to the man formed of the earth (Gen. 2: 7).
185. See Wedderburn art.cit., pp.313f.
186. Quaest. in Gen. I, 4. Wedderburn, ibid., p.312, also interprets the text thus, although it merely speaks of the moulded man as a likeness of the intelligible type (? νοητὸς τρόπος ).
187. De opif. 69.
188. CG II 14,18-24; CG IV 22,23 - 23,2. The short recension is less clear at this point and has lacunae in the text.
189. Ibid.
190. BG 35,4f.; CG III 13,2; CG II 8,32f.
191. OnOrWld CG II 103,29-32.
192. CG II 108,2-12.
193. Eug CG III 81,10-12 = SJC BG 100,12-14; CG III 105,11-13; SJC BG 108,8-11. Cf. Eug CG III 85,9f.; CG V 13,8f.

194. Val. frag. 1 in Clem. Alex. Strom. II 36,4. (Stählin 132).
195. Cf. Iren. adv. haer. I 1,1f. (Harvey I 10f.); Hipp. Ref. VI 29,6f. (Wendland 156.15-22).
196. I 5,3 (Harvey I 45f.). Cf. the Demiurge's creative activity in Exc. ex Theod. 47,2-3 (Sagnard 158) and the Marcosian view in Iren. adv. haer. I 17,1-2 (Harvey I 164-8).
197. See n.150.
198. Hipp. Ref. X 9,1 (Wendland 268.12-16).
199. See p.255 n.193.
200. See pp.248f.
201. Note the creative role of the Βενλὴ Θεοῦ (CH I,8); the relationship of Νοῦς as Σωτήρ and φῶς with his son Ἀνθρωπος who is equal to him (I,9,12) and the latter's anthropogonic role (I,13-18). There may indeed be some echo of Gen. 1: 26 in that Ἀνθρωπος is the εἰκὼν of his father (I,12), reflected in Nature below, and in that the men produced are in accordance with the appearance of the Ἀνθρωπος (I,17: πρὸς τὸ εἶδος τοῦ Ἀνθρώπου) and bisexual (ἡρεσεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος) in accordance with the natures of the seven Administrators.
202. Iren. adv. haer. I 30,6 (Harvey I 232).
203. See n.196.
204. Iren. adv. haer. I 30,6 (Harvey I 232); 5,5 (Harvey I 49); Exc. ex Theod. 50,1-3 (Sagnard 162-4).
205. Valentinus' view that the angels created Adam in the name of the pre-existent Anthropos appears to mark a transitional stage between the original motif of the actual appearance of the heavenly Adam(as) and the more sophisticated view that denies any knowledge of the heavenly world to the Demiurge and has him create man in his own image, as in the Ptolemaean conception. GrSeth CG VII 51,20 - 54,16 presents a Christological version of this motif which has the archons believing they are crucifying Christ for his 'false' claims to be the Son of Man, imagining their own creation, Adam, to be meant and ignoring the true heavenly Man, whose Son Christ is and whom he proclaims.



206. In the latter, however, alongside the earthly figure of Seth as son of Adam there are indications of a heavenly Seth, after whom the former is named (CG V 65,6ff.). The latter is the seed of great aeons and progenitor of the chosen race of the Gnostics. It is this heavenly figure, who is independent of the Seth whom Adam is addressing, whom the Illuminator proclaims (76,28 - 77,3), who is the Man higher than the Archon and his powers and who arouses their wrath (77,4-7). He it is who will appear in chosen bodies (holy houses), unseen by the powers, and who will finally appear in the flesh of the man on whom the Holy Spirit descends (i.e. Jesus), whom the powers will punish (77,7-18). This presentation, far from being pre- or non-Christian, as Böhlig and others would argue, seems to echo the coming of Christ, the Son of Man as proclaimed by John the Baptist ("one greater than I": Mk.1: 7; Mt.3: 11f.; Lk.3: 16ff.), his union at baptism with the man Jesus through the descent of the Holy Spirit (Jn.1: 19-34; Mk.1: 10f.; Mt.3: 16f.; Lk.3: 21f.), and the suffering of Jesus. A similar kind of docetic Christology appears in e.g. the Ophite system, and Irenaeus' account of Basilides (adv.haer. I 24,4: Harvey I 200) and GrSeth contain parallel material. See further below.
207. Thus NatArch CG II 96,27 - 97,4 speaks of the coming, after three generations (cf. the three advents of ApocAd, GEgypt, AJ CG II etc.), of the true Man in creaturely form, with, or as, the Holy Spirit, sent by the Father to teach about everything and anoint (  $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\mu\varsigma$  - a reference to Christ?). OnOrWld CG II 103,19-28 has Sophia tell Ialdabaoth of the eschatological appearance of an immortal light-Man in Ialdabaoth's created realm to annihilate him and remove the deficiency, while 123,23ff. speaks of his  $\pi\alpha\rho\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$  at the end. He may also be identified with the Logos of 125,14-23, who is eschatological revealer and judge.
208. CG II 63,4 - 64,9 = CG IV 74,17 - 75,24.
209. CG II 30,11 - 31,25.
210. BG 121,14 - 126,16; CG III 117,1 - 119,8.
211. CH I,27-32. Here the narrator's role as revealer and saviour is clear, but that of eschatological judge is absent or reinterpreted in terms of immediate response to his message (29), as in John's Gospel (e.g. 5:22-4). Salvation is the recognition of one's essential Man, who is life and light (18,21). Cf. the role of the Logos in the Naassene Preaching, Hipp. Ref. V 7,30-33 (Wendland 85.23 - 87.6) and of the Son of God in Zos. On the Letter Omega §§14-15 (Scott-Ferguson Hermetica IV, p.109).

212. OnOrWld CG II 112, 10-13.
213. BG 121, 13-17.
214. On Man/ Ἀνθρώπου πατρὶς as an aeon of the Ogdoad cf. Iren. adv. haer. I 1, 1 (Harvey I 10); on him as the Father cf. I 12, 3 (Harvey I 113f.).
215. I 12, 3 (Harvey *ibid.*); 15, 3 (Harvey I 151f.).
216. I 5, 6 (Harvey I 51).
217. OnOrWld CG II 103, 15-28. Precisely the same themes; the advent of the perfect true man or Saviour or Son of God as revealer and judge, his trampling on the powers of evil or death and the ascent of him and his elect occur in NatArch CG II 96, 33 - 97, 16; SJC BG 125, 10-16 = CG III 118, 22- 119, 8; Zos. On the Letter Omega §§14, 15, 8 (Scott-Ferguson Hermetica IV pp. 107f.).
218. CG II 107, 18 - 108, 12.
219. 112, 25 - 113, 9.
220. 115, 11-23.
221. 115, 20 - 116, 8. However, the powers on seeing her do ask "What is this (masculine) light? She is like this image which appeared to us in the light" (my emphases).
222. Cf. frag. 35 on Jn. 4: 37 in Orig. Comm in Joh. XIII 49: the Son of Man above the "Place" sows (seeds, i.e. souls).
223. Cf. Exc. ex Theod. 47, 1 (Sagnard 156). The Saviour is the universal Demiurge who solidifies Achamoth's passions into various forms of matter (Iren. adv. haer. I 4, 5: Harvey I 39-41).
224. See above pp. 238f.
225. Cf. OnOrWld CG II 103, 19-28; NatArch CG II 96, 33 - 97, 9; SJC BG 126, 12-16 = CG III 119, 4-8. The latter may, however, be more dependent on Lk. 10: 17-20. On κριτὰ θεῶν τεῖν and κερσμεύς cf. Is. 41: 25; Ps. 2: 9.

226. Cf. Zos. On the Letter Omega §14 (Scott-Ferguson Hermetica IV p.108). This text too may be more dependent on Lk. 10: 17-20 than on Ps. 8: 7. Cf. also Gen. 3: 15; Ps. 91: 13. Athanasius in de inc. 27 makes much of this theme of Christians trampling on death, employing both  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\pi\alpha\tau\epsilon\iota\nu$  and  $\kappa\epsilon\rho\alpha\upsilon\sigma$ .
227. B. Sanh. 38b. Cf. Pesikta Rabbati 20: 4.
228. B. Shabb. 88b attributes it to R. Joshua b. Levi, a tanna and Palestinian amora of the 3rd century. Cf. Pesikta Rabbati 20: 4; ARN 18b.
229. Pesikta Rabbati 14,9; Pesikta deRab Kahana 4,3. Cf. Num.R. XIX, 3.
230. Gen.R. VIII,6. It is ascribed to the mid-fourth century Palestinian amora R. Huna in the name of R. Aibu, an early fourth century Palestinian amora.
231. Midr. Teh. 8,2.
232. Cf. Justin Dial. 62,1; TriTrac CG I 112,35 - 113,1; Mishna Sanh. 4,5; b Sanh. 38b; Gen.R. VIII,9; Deut.R. II,13. On this see now A.F. Segal, Two Powers in Heaven, Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity XXV), Leiden 1978.
233. Cf. e.g. Menander according to Tert. de res. carn. 5; Saturninus in Iren. adv.haer. I 24,1 (Harvey I 196); Tert. de anima 23,1; Basilides according to Iren. adv.haer. I 24,4 (Harvey I 200); the Baruch of Justin in Hipp. Ref. V 26,7 (Wendland 127.28-31); Valentinus frag. 1 in Clem. Alex. Strom. II 36,2ff.; AJ BG 48,6-17 and parr.; NatArch CG II 87,23-33 etc.
234. GrSeth CG VII 53,24 - 54,8. Cf. the centurion's comment in Mk. 15: 38.
235. ApocAd CG V 76,28 - 77,27. See above n.206. Could the deceitful name and lying words be allusions to Christ's claim to be the Son of Man?
236. The question, "what is the power of this man?", might refer to the Illuminator, but clearly two people are involved here, and the mention of the flesh of the man on whom the Spirit will descend being punished does suggest Christ's supposed suffering.

- But cf. the discussion by Schottroff of this question of whether the suffering figure is Jewish and pre-Christian as Böhlig and MacRae argue, or in fact not a suffering Saviour at all, but the salvandus in "Animae naturaliter salvandae", BZNW 37 (1969), pp.73,82f.
237. ApocAd CG V 77,16-18. Cf. Mt. 3: 16; Mk. 1: 10; Lk. 3: 21f.; Jn. 1: 32-4. Could the frequent references to the Illuminator coming "on the water" and the mention of his seed receiving his name "upon the water" (  $\epsilon\chi\mu\ \pi\iota\mu\omicron\omicron\upsilon\tau$  ; 78,5.17.26; 79,18f.27; 80,9.20; 81,14.23; 82,3f. 10.17;  $\tau\iota\lambda\mu\ \pi\iota\mu\omicron\omicron\upsilon\tau$  83,6) not also be a baptismal reference combining Gen. 1: 2, the Spirit of God  $\epsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\omega\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \psi\acute{\epsilon}\delta\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , and the Gospel passages about the Spirit's descent on Jesus? This seems a more plausible explanation than Böhlig's appeal to Iranian parallels in pp.90f. of his edition of the Apocalypse of Adam.
238. Cf. Mt. 3: 17; Mk. 1: 11 and especially Lk. 3: 22 which quotes Ps. 2: 7, as does Heb. 1: 5.
239. Traces of an angelic question might be suggested by the powers' reaction to the heavenly voice in Iren. adv.haer. I 30, 6 (Harvey I 232): Conturbatis autem omnibus ad novam vocem et inopinabili nuncupatione, et quaerentibus unde clamor ...
240. See n.50 and the Encyclopaedia Judaica, Jerusalem, 1971, vol. 4 'B', s.v. bat kol.
241. Hipp. Ref. V 26,15-16 (Wendland 129.6-14). Again the Demiurge's request and the reply are from a Psalm (118 (117): 19f.) and here too we have his assertion that he thought that he was the Lord. Cf. the response of the Demiurge to a voice and vision informing him of the real state of affairs above him according to the Basilidians (Clem. Alex. Strom. II 36,1).
242. Borsch, Christian and Gnostic Son of Man, pp.115ff. G. Vermes in M. Black, An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts, 3rd ed., Oxford, 1967, Appendix E, pp.310-28, has argued that the phrase "the Son of Man" was not and could not have been understood as a title in Aramaic, that it was simply a circumlocution referring obliquely to the speaker. This suggests that, although Jews may have speculated about a heavenly Man figure, they were unlikely to have developed ideas about a heavenly Son of Man based on the phrase as a title. Black's reply (ibid., p.328f.), that the phrase is suitable for Aramaic use as a

Messianic title, pace Vermes, and that it was so used by Jesus would suggest that Christian usage did play some part in the Gnostic development of the phrase.

243. See above p.238f. However, in sayings 102 and 120 the Son of Man is clearly Christ.
244. SJC BG 99,6-9; 101,6-9. Cf. CG III 105,19-22.
245. Iren. adv.haer. I 30,13 (Harvey I 239).
246. I 30,1 (Harvey I 227). See also p.236.
247. I 12, 3 (Harvey I 113). Note that the figure referred to here is the Saviour, the 2nd Christ-figure, the Fruit of the Pleroma, not the original Christ.
248. Cf. Hipp. Ref. VI 36, 4 (Wendland 166.10-14). Cf. the roles of the Living Spirit, the Third Envoy and Jesus patibilis in Manicheism.
249. BG 48,1-14; CG III 21,21-22,6. CG III 22,3 reads: "in the  $\tau\upsilon\pi\omicron\varsigma$  of the  $\epsilon\iota\kappa\omega\nu$  " and 22,5f. has "  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ ,  $\theta\iota\kappa\omega\nu$   $\delta\gamma[\omega]$   $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha$ ,  $\pi\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\iota\eta\epsilon$  .
250. CG II 14,18-24; CG IV 22,23 - 23,2.
251. CG II 14,24-34; CG IV 23,3-15. On the motif of a light appearing to the archons in which is visible the form of heavenly Man cf. OnOrWld CG II 108,2-13.
252. So also Giversen, Apocryphon, pp.240f.
253. Cf. BG 20,19 - 21,2; CG II 1,31-33. On the motif of archontic terror and the shaking of the foundations at the appearance of a heavenly being or the exclamation of a heavenly voice cf. GrSeth CG VII 51,25-31; TrimProt CG XIII 40,8-22; PS Book I chs. 2-3 (Schmidt-MacDermot 4.20 - 6.24). On such phenomena as eschatological accompaniments of the revelation of God as judge cf. Is. 24: 18; I Enoch 1, 5; 60,1; Ass.Mos. 10,3f. See also W.C. van Unnik, "Die 'geöffneden Himmel' in der Offenbarungsvision des Apokryphons des Johannes" in Apophoreta: Festschrift Ernst Haenchen BZNW 30 (1964), pp.269-80.

254. BG 49,6-9; CG III 22,15-18. Cf. CG II 15,11-13; CG IV 23,29 - 24,2. As Janssens points out (art.cit., p.410), this recalls and confirms the point that the perfect Man is an aeon of light and she cites the Light-Adam of OnOrWld CG II 108,21; 112,10,25; 117,28. That the first man is called "Adam" by the angels is the gist of a gloss in Zos. On the letter Omega, §11 (Scott-Ferguson, Hermetica IV, p.106.24).
255. See above pp.245 n. 134 and 254 n.182.
256. OnOrWld CG II 108,2-13.
257. NatArch CG II 94,19-33.
258. See n.50.
259. H.Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, pp.161-5.
260. In somn.Scip. II, 11. Jonas, op.cit., p.158.
261. Hipp. Ref. V 19. Cf. ParShem CG VII 1,25 - 4,21.
262. Ref. V 12ff.
263. Plot. Enneads II 9,10.
264. In Hegemonius, Acta Archelai LXVII, 2-11 (Beeson 96.4 - 97.2).
265. Cf. NatArch CG II 94,28-33.
266. Jonas, *ibid.*, p.162. Cf. OnOrWld CG II 103,28-32 (Sophia appears); 108,3-13 (Light and a man-like image appear).
267. BG 48,10-14; CG III 22,3-6.
268. CG II 15,1-5; CG IV 23,16-20.
269. This comes several lines later in BG 49,6-9 and par.
270. Is this perhaps part of an attempt to make the work more acceptable to orthodox Christians? The rabbis explained the plural "Let us make" in terms of God addressing or consulting the council of his angels (cf. Gen.R. VIII, 4f.). Philo interpreted Gen. 1: 26 in terms of God taking others as his fellow



workers, de opif. 75; de fug. 68-72; de conf. ling. 171-5 . Note that in the long recension, as in the short, Ialdabaoth is not explicitly mentioned as having taken any part in the first act of man's creation: only the seven create. Have we here a trace of the attempt to combine the motif of man's creation by (7) angels with a picture more acceptable to Christians and Jews - God creates (with the aid of, or through intermediaries)? The Ophite version in Iren. adv. haer. I 30,6 (Harvey I 232), which has Ialdabaoth utter Gen. 1: 26 and his six offspring do the actual creating, may mark an earlier stage of this process in which Ialdabaoth is distinguished from the original seven creators, as in Saturninus. However, Plato, in Tim. 69C, represents the Demiurge as responsible for framing divine things, leaving the creating of mortal things to his offspring, who imitate him, housing the immortal soul they are given in the body, and adding a mortal soul subject to passions. This may represent another source of the motif of the Demiurge and the archons being both involved in man's creation. On Gen. 1: 26 see R. McL. Wilson, "The Early History of the Exegesis of Gen. 1: 26", Studia Patristica 1 (TU 63), pp.420-437.

271. Cf. Crum, Dictionary, 80b (s.v. ΕΙΝΕ ).
272. CG II 112,33 - 113,1 (man in the εἰκὼν of the archons' body, and in the likeness ( ΕΙΝΕ ) of Light-Adam). Cf. Nat Arch CG II 87,29-33. The Valentinian Exposition ~~CG II~~ 27,32-6 has the Demiurge create a man according to his image on the one hand, and on the other, according to the likeness of those who exist from the first.
273. According to Hegemonius, Acta Archelai XII, 1f. (Beeson 19.13f., 26f. - 20.1-5, 18-22).
274. OnOrWld CG II 112,26 - 113,2.
275. NatArch CG II 87,33 - 88,1.
276. Cf. CG II 11,7-9; BG 42,13 - 43,2.
277. BG 48,14 - 52,1 and parr.
278. See H.-M. Schenke, Der Gott 'Mensch' passim and especially p.155.



279. Adv.haer. I 24,2 (Harvey I, 196f.).
280. On the rabbinic motif of Adam as an incomplete lump ( אֲדָמָה cf. Ps. 139: 16), see G. Scholem, "Die Vorstellung von Golem in ihrem tellurischen und magischen Beziehungen" Eranos Jahrbuch XXII (1953), Zürich 1954, pp.237-43; K. Rudolph, "Ein Grundtyp.", p.15 n.83. Schottroff, Der Glaubende, pp.3-41, gives a detailed analysis of this motif in Gnostic thought.
281. See n.50.
282. See n.264. Basilides probably intended to oppose these ideas, representing as they do a basic dualism. Hegemonius appears to attribute them to a certain Scythianus who, according to him (LXII, 2-5; Beeson 90.11 - 91,3), was a "Saracenus" who lived in Egypt at the time of the apostles.
283. Cf. NatArch CG II 94,28-33.
284. This could be taken as a version or echo of the Platonic theory sketched in the Timaeus and elsewhere. That such a version rather than the original more abstract Platonic one could have formed a major source for the more abstract and demythologised Gnostic theologies of the Valentinian schools (as indeed Irenaeus suggests in adv.haer. I 30,14: Harvey I, 241), is perhaps confirmed by the Valentinian Exposition of Codex XI, as well as by fragment 1 of Valentinus. See further below.
285. Enn. II 9,10. Cf. Zostr CG VIII 9,16 - 10,17, which may have been Plotinus' source. On this see now Puech, En quête de la Gnose, I, pp.110-16.
286. Hipp. Ref. V 19,2 (Wendland 116.25-7).
287. V 19,5-6 (Wendland 117.8-17).
288. 19,7 (Wendland 117.22-4).
289. 19,8-10. (Wendland 117.24 - 118.10).
290. Cf. e.g. ParShem CG VII 1,1, 25- 5,6. Frederik Wisse, in the introduction to his translation in The Nag Hammadi Library, p.308, describes the Paraphrase of Seth as "apparently a Christianized version of a tractate similar to the Paraphrase of Shem". But

- cf. the discussion of this in M. Tardieu, "Les Livres mis sous le nom de Seth et les Séthiens de l'hérésiologie", Gnosis and Gnosticism (NHS VIII), Leiden 1977, p.205 n.6. He would see ParShem as a later reworking of the Paraphrase of Seth.
291. Cf. AJ BG 49,6-9 and parr. (Adam's power as a light for the archons); OnOrWld CG II 113,1-5 (Light-Adam as a servant for the archons).
292. NatArch CG II 94,21-33. Other texts account for the presence of light in darkness by other means, e.g. overflow (Ophites of Iren. adv.haer. I 30,2: Harvey I 227f.), or mistake (Pistis Sophia mistaking the archontic light below here for her heavenly light and descending, PS Book I chs. 30f.; Schmidt-MacDermot 43.13 - 46.22).
293. 87,20-3.
294. Iren. adv.haer. I 24,1 (Harvey I, 196f.); Hipp.Ref. VII 28,2 (Wendland 208.12-17).
295. Cf. Poimandres CH I, 2 ( ⲉ ⲧⲏⲥ ⲁⲓⲑⲉⲙⲧⲏⲥ ⲙⲟⲩⲥ ); NatArch CG II 94,24; AJ BG 60,17 = CG II 23,25; CG II 29,12f., etc.
296. Adv.omn.haer. 1 (Kroymann 214.5-14).
297. Div.haer.lib. XXXI, 105 (Marx CSEL 16.1-17).
298. Pan. XXIII 1,1-10 (Holl 1,247.15 - 249,18).
299. Haer.fab.comp. I, 3 (P.G. 83,348A-B).
300. Div.haer.lib. XXXI, 203 (Marx 16.8-10).
301. Pan. XXIII 1,5f. (Holl 1 248.11-18).
302. Imago Dei, p.152. Jervell's claim that the Anthropos is both the inner man and the true Eikon is not fully borne out by the evidence he cites. That the Anthropos is both the divine spark or seed and the inner man is only made explicit in the Poimandres, the Naassene Preaching (where it does not appear that Adamas himself descends), and the Valentinian systems (e.g. Iren. adv.haer. I 5,5: Harvey I 49). The Ophites of Irenaeus, the Apocryphon and the Sophia speak of a trace of light or light

power or drop of light respectively, which are not connected with or identified as heavenly man or inner man, and do not descend because of earthly man being in the image. In the first two of these the divine element is transmitted through Ialdabaoth, i.e. it is already present in the lower realm.

303. "Ein Grundtyp", p.15. Cf. Schottroff, Der Glaubende, p.24.

304. NatArch CG II 87,11 - 88,11.

305. Ἀφθαρσία appears as one of the heavenly pentad of aeons in AJ (BG 28,15f., 29,13 and 32,31). In the last case she and the light, Christ, produce the four great lights. Cf. Iren. adv.haer. I 29,1f. (Harvey I, 222f.). Ὡμνωτῶντες κτλ has already occurred twice in NatArch at 87,1f., where it is unclear whether a heavenly figure or region is meant. The former is evidently the case, however, in our present passage. Cf. OnOrWld CG III 103,2-18.

306. CG II 87,17-20. Such a division suggests the classic three-fold pattern of Valentinianism -- pneumatic, psychic and hylic, and just such a pattern appears to underlie our treatise (in its present form at least). Thus the archons create choic man (87,24-33), their great one breathes into him and he becomes psychic (88,3-5), whereupon the Spirit descends (88,11-17). But the archons and Ialdabaoth are depicted by our text in a much more negative fashion than the psychic Demiurge of the Ptolemaeans. Have we here the traces of the transition from a basic dualism of body (created by hostile angels) and Spirit (send down from heaven), as in Saturninus, to the three-fold division of classic 2nd century Gnosticism, of man made of hylic and psychic elements but also possessing the pneumatic element or seed (introduced by Achamoth, often via the Demiurge)?

307. Cf. NatArch CG II 95,1-4.

308. The picture presented is rather ambiguous. Are the archons attempting to lure the heavenly being down, or trap the image below? The former may be more likely since the archons had not been able to reach the image in the waters. Although the term Πνευματικός εἶναι is masculine, as referring back to the masculine εἶναι, is there perhaps a suggestion here that the male co-image is meant to lure down the female heavenly being (Ἀφθαρσία)? The well known myth of the seduction of the

archons in e.g. Manicheism might be seen as a reversal of this. But man in our text would appear to be androgynous inasmuch as he is created after the body of the androgynous archons (87,27-31).

309. 88,3-5.

310. 88,5f.

311. 88,7-17. As Bullard notes (Hypostasis, p.68), a Jewish etymology is apparent here: Adam (אָדָם) is named from Adamah (אֲדָמָה) virgin earth. Cf. OnOrWld CG II 108,24f. But in 115, 1-3 Adam is named after the one before him, i.e. Light-Adam.

312. This two-stage version - the archons create man in God's image, but he is incomplete and an inanimate Golem until the Creator God breathes the breath of life into him - may reflect the views of heterodox Jewish groups of the 1st and 2nd centuries A.D. basing their interpretation on a distinction between Gen. 1: 26 and 2: 7. Cf. Gen.R. XIV 8, VIII 1. We have already noted the evidence of Justin (Dial. 62) and the Tripartite Tractate (TriTrac CG I 112,35 - 113,1) about the creative role of angels according to some Jews, and referred to Philo's explanation of Gen. 1: 26 in terms of God assigning the creation of the baser elements in man to subordinate powers or angels (de opif. 75; de fug. 68-70; de conf.ling. 171-5). Such a two-stage view could readily have been interpreted to suggest that the angels were hostile to God, an idea underlying the views of early Gnostics like Simon Magus, Menander and Saturninus and found in characteristic rabbinic garb in b Sanh. 38b; Gen. R. VIII,6; Midrash Teh. 8,2 etc. Cf. A. Böhlig, "Der jüdische und judenchristliche Hintergrund in gnostischen Texten von Nag Hammadi" in Le Origini, p.123. See also his Mysterion und Wahrheit, Leiden 1968, pp.50-101.

313. There is little here to support Bullard's interpretation (Hypostasis pp.67, 71), which has the Spirit come up from the adamantine earth. The text simply speaks of the Spirit coming out of the adamantine land and descending (ἀφ' ἑμὲ τῆς : 88,13f.). Cf. 96,20-24 which speaks of the soul's descent from the incorruptible light. The play on Ἀδμῆς, אָדָם, Ἀδμῆς, ἀδμῆς τινος certainly reflects Jewish conceptions but Ἀδμῆς and ἀδμῆς τινος only make sense in a heavenly context as referring to, or characterising heavenly Adam. The Barbelognostics thus interpret the title Ἀδμῆς as meaning "unconquered" and apply it to the heavenly true Man and his offspring (Iren. adv.haer. I 29,3 (Harvey I, 224)). Although

OnOrWld (CG II 108,19-25) does interpret the earth spreading over the holy Adamas as "the holy adamantine ( $\acute{\alpha}\delta\alpha\mu\alpha\delta\iota\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\eta$ ) earth", the earth is only called such as a result of the descent of the light from Light-Adam, which Pronoia releases over the earth because she cannot reach Light-Adam himself. This light or blood of the virgin is honoured by all the powers and purifies the earth as the figure of Pistis purified the waters of chaos. Cf. M. Tardieu, Trois mythes gnostiques: Adam, Eros et les animaux d'Égypte dans un écrit de Nag Hammadi (II,5), Paris 1974, p.88f. G. Scholem's argument in "Die Vorstellung vom Golem in ihren tellurischen und magischen Beziehungen", Eranos Jahrbuch XXII (1953), Zürich 1954, p.242f., for the existence of an early Jewish tradition of a telluric soul in Adam, based on Gen. 1: 24, does not cast much light on these passages in NatArch and OnOrWld.

314. Art.cit.

315. Op.cit., pp.67-71.

316. 94,27-33. But precisely how this can or should be harmonised with the rest of the work is not clear. This passage suggests that light is already trapped in matter whereas the anthropogonical section seems to imply that light appears to darkness and cannot be reached by it.

317. CG II 103,8-22.

318. 103,32 - 107,17. A further example of the imitation idea.

319. 107,17 - 108,14.

320. 108,14-19.

321. 108,19-27. On this see n.312. See also Böhlig's edition, pp.58-61; Bullard, Hypostasis, pp.68ff.; Tardieu, Trois mythes, pp.88f. Tardieu (ibid., pp.90f.) draws attention to the useful parallel material in Zosimus, On the Letter Omega, and in Olympiodorus' commentary on Zosimus.

322. 108,27-31.

323. 109,1 - 112,1.

324. 112,10-13. Is this OnOrWld's version of Jonas' idea (iii) - by the very fact of the light's reflection being trapped in earth's embrace the light itself is somehow deficient?
325. Is this an equivalent of the Middle or *Τόπος* - the region of the Mother, the Demiurge and the psychics in Valentinianism? Or is it, as Rudolph suggests (Die Gnosis: Wesen und Geschichte einer spätantiken Religion, Leipzig 1977, p.84), the sphere of the fixed stars? The latter seems more likely.
326. 112,13-31. Since there has been no mention before now of Light-Adam destroying the archons' work, but only Pistis' threat that he would (103,19-28), it seems best to interpret this as a future. Such an interpretation corresponds better to Ialdabaoth's reply - earthly man is thus created precisely to prevent such a destruction.
327. 112,31 - 113,5.
328. 113,5-10. On man as a vehicle for the divine and thus a means of condemning the Demiurge cf. SJC BG 119,2-16.
329. 113,12 - 114,24. This figure is the occasion for further word-play and the conflation of Jewish and Greek traditions. See Böhlig's edition, pp.72-4.
330. 117,30-33.
331. 114,29 - 115,3.
332. 115,3-11. Böhlig, on p.78 of his edition, calls attention both to the biblical background (temptation of Jesus etc.) and to the requirement in the Hellenistic world that 40 days purification be carried out after an abortion. He fails to note, however, that according to Philo, Quaest.in Gen. I, 25, the moulding of man takes 40 days, and that Jubilees, 3, 9 has Adam brought into Eden after 40 days. See further S.C. Malan, Book of Adam and Eve, pp.209f.
333. 115,11-30. This recalls the rabbis' division of the creation of man into 12 hours (b Sanh. 38b; ARN 17b; Ginzberg, Legends V, p.79 n.22); in the first dust was gathered, in the second man was kneaded into a shapeless lump, in the third his limbs were shaped, in the fourth a soul was infused, in the fifth he rose to his feet ..... Elements of this can perhaps be detected in



- Saturninus' account of man's animation in Iren. adv.haer. I 24,1 (Harvey I 197); the spark of life raised the man, equipped him with limbs and made him live.
334. 115,30 - 116,9. On the theme of heavenly pity on the Golem cf. Saturninus in Iren. adv.haer. I 24,1 (Harvey I 197); OnOrWld CG II 115,36 - 116,8. Schottroff (Der Glaubende, p.25f.) argues that the odd reaction of the archons suggests a correction of the original (Adam is a Golem who is animated by Sophia's breath, thus terrifying the archons) in that, once inbreathed, Adam can move but not rise. The Untitled Treatise, she believes, has combined what are two separate events in the Apocryphon - Adam's animation and awakening by Eve. Thus the inbreathing, originally representing the complete redemption of Adam, has to be weakened. But could another explanation not be either that here we have traces of the rabbinic idea of Adam's creation in stages (cited in the previous note), or that this reflects a heterodox Jewish understanding of man's creation whereby man was created as a Golem by the angels and, much to their relief, animated after a period by God? Cf. SJC BG 121, 3-6: the archons welcomed the breath into the soul.
335. Could the appearance of Sophia have been suggested by a Gnostic interpretation of Gen. 1: 2, the figure of the Spirit (feminine in Hebrew) borne over the waters? For a Gnostic, the following verse would record the consequent appearance of a heavenly Light-Man (ϕως - φως). Ialdabaoth's taunt in NatArch CG II 94,27f. and OnOrWld CG II 107,36 - 108,2 might be a Gnostic version of God's command in Gen. 1: 3: γενηθήτω φως .
336. 117,28 - 118,5. The three Adams, the choic, psychic and pneumatic, correspond to three elements in man: the moulded body in which is imprisoned a soul (114,15-24), and in which is also concealed a spirit in the likeness of heavenly Adam (123,31 - 124,25). Böhlig, on p.99f. of his edition, however, interprets the spirits as the light souls in men of 110,25; 114,16. Certainly the role of the psychic Adam is primarily to instruct the souls, but this would correspond to the function of the psychic element vis à vis the pneumatic in Valentinianism - for which the three-fold division is fundamental.
337. CH I,12. For an illuminating commentary on this which corrects the tendency of Dodd, The Bible and the Greeks, London 1935, to see the influence of Genesis everywhere, see E.Haenchen, "Aufbau und Theologie des Poimandres", Z.Th.K. 53 (1956) pp.170-191.



338. Ibid. This neatly resolves the problem of how the supreme God could fall. He does not, but his offspring who is identical does descend, not through archontic deceit, but by a fatal mistake. Poimandres thus represents Schenke's second type of God "Man" doctrine, whereby not the Supreme God but an emanation descends into earthly man (Der Gott "Mensch", pp.64f.). Whether Schenke's distinction is not too clear-cut is debateable. Strenuous attempts are made in virtually all Gnostic texts to avoid or tone down the conclusion that the supreme God actually appears or descends. If Barbelo is the subject of the theophany in the Apocryphon, and Schenke's prime example of his first type, she appears not as herself but in the form of a man.
339. I, 13.
340. Haenchen, *op.cit.*, p.172.
341. Ibid., p.173. Haenchen appears to misinterpret this periphery as the fixed dome between the planetary spheres and sub-lunar region, whereas it is evidently the circle between the sphere of the fixed stars and the seven planetary spheres.
342. I, 14. Nature is here hypostatized and her action strikingly resembles that of the Pronoia of Ialdabaoth in OnOrWld CG II 108, 3-18, as well as that of Darkness in Basilides' "barbarian" source (Acta Archelai LXVII, 8:Beeson 97.4-7). This motif is the basis of Jonas' idea (i). Haenchen, *ibid.*, claims to find here the incorporation of what he terms the well-known Gnostic myth according to which the corporeal world in the form of an alluring female seduces the envoy or son of God. Unfortunately, however, he cites no evidence to support his claim. The passage from OnOrWld might offer some support in this regard. More common is the motif of a heavenly female being seducing the archons (e.g. in the views of the "Gnostics" of Epiph. Pan. XXV 2,4). The Hypostasis has the archons fall in love with the (female?) image (CG II 87, 11-14; cf. 89, 17-21). Manicheism appears to combine the ideas of OnOrWld and NatArch in its motif of the androgynous Envoy seducing the male archons by appearing as a female and vice versa (cf. Theodore bar Konai, Lib.Schol. XI, Pognon pp.129, 190: Adam, Texte p.20. 127-37).
343. Ibid. Heavenly Man's hostile reaction is made explicit in OnOrWld CG II 108, 16-18 and Basilides' "barbarian" source is emphatic that Darkness' initiative was unsuccessful and that light felt no longing for Darkness (Acta Archelai LXVII, 9: Beeson 97, 7-13).

344. It is perhaps further evidence of our author's attempt to exculpate Man that he uses the verb φιλεῖν here, thus avoiding ἐρᾶν and ἔρως, which have negative connotations for him: Nature smiles with ἔρως (14); she embraces her lover (ὁ ἐρωόμενος); Man is overcome by [ἔρως and ὕπνος] (15); ἔρως is the cause of death (18), etc. That Man is described as uniting with Nature since both were ἐρωόμενοι (14) is understandable in that, having descended, he is now within the realm of ἔρως.
345. I, 14.
346. I, 15.
347. So Haenchen, op.cit., p.175.
348. I, 16. As Haenchen points out (ibid.), that they are androgynous means that they are not yet subject to ἔρως and death. The catastrophe has not yet taken place! The reference to their standing upright (μετὰρσιος) may be an interpretation or oblique rejection of the Golem motif. Cf. Schottroff, Der Glau-bende, p.23. According to the rabbis (Gen.R. VIII,11; XIV 3), man's standing upright was one of his celestial or angelic attributes.
349. I, 17.
350. Schenke argues (Gott "Mensch", pp.46ff.) that the influence of Genesis is manifest in such elements as Man and his seven earthly sons being androgynous (15,16), echoing Gen. 1: 27. But the theme of gods as androgynous is widely attested in pagan classical tradition (on this see Bullard, Hypostasis, pp.60f.; he refers in a footnote (n.109) to Nock and Festugière's edition of the Poimandres p.20 n.24), and for the view that man was originally androgynous we have the famous passage in Plato's Symposium (189E-193C). In any case, that heavenly and earthly figures are androgynous, and thus immune from ἔρως, is integral to our author's scheme, not a mere picturesque detail borrowed from Gen. 1: 27.
351. Although, as Haenchen points out (op.cit., pp.172f., 181f.), the seven appear in 25 as hostile planetary powers, whose negative characteristics must be stripped off in the ascent of the soul. It is here that the Gnostic influence is clearest.

352. Op.cit., p.177.
353. Ibid., p.190. The Poimandres version may be watered down in that Man's descent is excused, but is this any more watered down than the vast majority of Gnostic systems? Forced to face the reality of the presence of the divine in matter, they tend to avoid even suggesting that heavenly Man fell and prefer Jonas' idea (iii), that it was only a reflection or a divine spark which descended, insisting that, in any case, this was all part of the divine plan to unscramble the mixture. Schottroff, op.cit., p.22, sees in the Poimandres the same attempt to limit the power of the Demiurge and his powers as she finds in works like the Apocryphon.
354. Gott "Mensch", pp.47f.
355. We have attempted to show the lack of convincing evidence that the Poimandres is directly acquainted with the LXX of Gen. 1 and 2, or that it frequently employs themes or motifs or terms found there. It does not seem possible to derive the idea of a heavenly Man entirely from speculation on Gen. 1: 26f., and the image-reflection motif occurs in cosmogonic form in the pagan guises of Basilides' "barbarians" and Plotinus' Gnostics.
356. CG III 59,1-9. CG IV has a lacuna at this point.
357. 59,4-9.
358. Cf. OnOrWld CG II 103,15-30; 107,17-22. See also NatArch CG II 87,1-4; ii-14 where a voice comes forth from Imperishability and then she looks down and her image appears in the waters below.
359. In CG III 59,24 the objects of Sakla's address are missing, but enough remains (NNEQ & [ .....] to suggest that "angels" is the most appropriate conjecture. See Böhlig and Wisse's edition, p.126.
360. On this see Schenke, Gott "Mensch", ch.XIV, pp.107-119.
361. Lib.Schol.XI (Pognon pp.129f.; 190f.; Adam, Texte p.20.122-173).

362. Is this perhaps a Manichean version of Pronoia's rejection by Light-Adam and the consequent production of trees etc. from the Eros who results from her light being shed on and embraced by the earth (OnOrWld CG II 108,14 - 110,1)?
363. In F.C. Andreas - W.Henning, "Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesisch - Turkestan, I", Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1932, pp.175-222.
364. b I R II 4 - V I 12 (Andreas-Henning, pp.182f.).
365. e I V I 1 - V II 31 (Andreas-Henning, pp.193f.).
366. c V I 2 - 9; V II 3-13 (Andreas-Henning, pp.196f.);  
d I R I 24-9. (Andreas-Henning, p.198).
367. Op.cit., p.113.
368. De natura boni 46 (Zycha CSEL 884.24 - 885.8). Here the King of Darkness calls on his companions in reaction to the great light which caused the Pole to move and the powers to tremble, to give him the portion of light in their power "so that I may form an image (imago) of the great figure who appeared in glory, that we may finally be able to rule freed from contact with Darkness".
369. Contra Manichaei opiniones disputatio, IV (Brinkmann 6.22-7.14).
370. H.J. Polotsky - A. Böhlig, Kephalaia I,1, Stuttgart 1940, p.133.8-15.
371. The verb in 1.26 is  $\epsilon\gamma\alpha\tau\eta\lambda\alpha\gamma$  . Cf. OnOrWld CG II 108,33 ( $\tau\eta\lambda\alpha$  ).
372. 133,21-29.
373. 133.31 - 134.11.
374. 135.14-26.
375. 136.23 - 137.6. Does this correspond to the half of sin in Theodore's account which fell on the dry land and produced the 5 trees?

376. 137.13 - 138.19. This makes Theodore's version more comprehensible, particularly as regards the role of Sin. Her role in the creation of man recalls that of Sophia in Iren. adv. haer. I 30,6 (Harvey I 232). She gives the powers the thought (excogitatio) of Man. Cf. also Keph. LXIV (157.3-11) where the idea of the heavenly image being sealed on Adam by the Demiurge and the creators of his body recurs, and LXX (179.1-5) where Hyle's role in seeing the image of the Envoy, creating the seal and the image of the flesh and laying the imprint of that image in the flesh, is recounted.
377. Acta Archelai XII, 1f. (Beeson 19.13 - 20.6). Note, however, the similarity of the second version of the archon's words with that of Keph. 138.2-4 and Theodore Lib. Schol. XI (Pognon pp. 130, 191; Adam Texte 21.163 - 22.167).
378. Such a picture may also underlie Acta Archelai XII, 1.
379. Acta Archelai VIII, 3 (Beeson 12.2-6).
380. Cf. Exc. ex Theod. 47,1 (Sagnard 156).
381. So Schenke, op.cit., p. 116 on the basis of Titus of Bostra, Contra Manichaeos III, 4f.
382. See n. 376.
383. Ibid., p. 119.
384. See n. 370.
385. It seems better to take μὲνεν as an adverb rather than as an adjective qualifying the man. If so, this could be an allusion to the common motif, based on Hebrew word-play of Adam (אָדָם) made from virgin earth (עֵפָר). Cf. Zos. On the Letter Omega § 19 (Scott-Ferguson Hermetica IV 106.17f., 121). Adam is interpreted γῆ πάροςθεν; Jos. Ant. I 1,2; Olympiodorus (Berthelot, p. 89); Eusebius, Praep. ev. 11,6,10f.
386. These two adjectives, the latter in its Coptic form ( ἀτκιμ or ετς νεκκιμ ), are frequently applied to the race of the Gnostics in e.g. AJ BG 22,15; 65,2f. = CG III 33,2f.; CG II 25,22f. etc.; GEgypt CG III 51,8f. = CG IV 63,3; CG III 59,13f.; CG III 61,20 = CG IV 73,3f. ( ἀσάλευτον ).

387. V 7,7 (Wendland 80.10-14). Cf. the Baruch of Justin, Hipp. Ref. V 26,20f. (Wendland 129.24 - 130.3), where Eden, who is responsible for the soul in man, punishes man's spirit, the gift of Elohim.
388. V 7,8 (Wendland 80.15-17).
389. Der Glaubende, pp.15-17.
390. 7,25 (Wendland 84.14-17; ἡ κίνητος... τὸ πᾶν κινεῖν ). This of course is an echo of the "unmoved Mover" of Aristotle.
391. 7,13f. (Wendland 81.21 - 82.4). Cf. Schottroff, Der Glaubende, p.17.
392. 8,1f. (Wendland 89.9-12).
393. 7,30 (Wendland 85.23 - 86.9).
394. Cf. 7, 30f. (Wendland 86.7-11); 7,35f. (Wendland 87.18 - 88,3); 8,14f. (Wendland 91.23 - 92.5); 8,41 (Wendland 96.21f.).
395. Ibid., p.19.
396. The Geryon motif does occur in the Preaching (8,4: Wendland 89.20-26) in the context of the three-fold division. Cf. also 7,9f. (Wendland 81.4f.: the Naassenes start with the Assyrian three-fold division of Man's soul); 8,44f. (Wendland 97.12-19).
397. 7,6 (Wendland 80.8).
398. 7,30f. (Wendland 86.8-11).
399. Fragment 1 in Clem.Alex. Strom. II 36,2-4 (Stählin 132.6-16); W. Volker, Quellen zur Geschichte der Christlichen Gnosis, Tübingen 1932, p.57f.
400. Strom. II 36,1 (Stählin 131.30 - 132.5). Cf. Hipp. Ref. VII 26,1-2.
401. In classical Greek ὥς δ'εἰ with a participle frequently has an ironical or sceptical tone. See J.D. Denniston, The Greek Particles, Oxford 1934, p.230. In OnOrWld CG II 115,6-9, Ialdabaoth is terrified lest the true Man come to his creature ( πλάσσειν ) and control it.



402. On the creators' terror at their creation's superiority cf. OnOrWld CG II 115,14-23.
403. Cf. OnOrWld CG II 115,1-3. Note the importance of the "name". In AJ BG 49, 6-9 and parr. it is not Adam's being in the image which guarantees possession of the divine power in the eyes of the archons, it is his having the divine name. Cf. the name speculation in GTr CG I 38,5- 41,14; Exc.ex Theod. 22,26,31 (Sagnard 102,110-112,126-8; la gnose valentinienne pp.557-9).
404. Cf. e.g. Ptolemaeans in Iren. adv.haer. I 1,1f. (Harvey I 10f.); Marcosians in adv.haer. I 18,2 (Harvey I 172).
405. See n.205.
406. The Nag Hammadi Library, p.435.
407. CG XI 37,32-8. On the distinction - image of the Demiurge, likeness of supreme beings cf. AJ CG II 15,2f.; OnOrWld CG II 112,33 - 113,1; 114,29-32; NatArch CG II 87,29-33; Acta Archelai XII, 1 (Beeson 19.13f. 26f. - 20.1-5, 18-22).
408. Iren. adv.haer. I 5,5 (Harvey I 49). Irenaeus' version is confirmed and complemented by Exc.ex Theod. 50,1-3 (Sagnard 162-4).
409. Exc.ex Theod. 47,2-3 (Sagnard 158).
410. See n.184.
411. This is a familiar theme in rabbinic literature, cf. Gen.R. VIII 1; XXI 3; XXIV 2; Midr. Teh. 139,5. See Ginzberg, Legends I, pp.59ff.; V, p.79 n.22.
412. Cf. Epiphanius' account of the Ophites, Pan. XXXVII 4, 1 (Holl 2,55.14ff.); and Saturninus according to Iren. adv.haer. I 24,1 (Harvey I 197) and Hipp. Ref. VII 28,3 (Wendland 208.17ff.). According to AJ BG 50,15 - 51,1 and parr., the Chaldeans (i.e. astrologers?) of the Naassene Preaching in Hipp. Ref. V 7,6 (Wendland 80.6f.), OnOrWld CG II 115, 9-15 and a Coptic magical text (Kropp, Ausgewählte Koptische Zaubertexte II, Brussels 1930,p.101), Adam was originally immobile. As Ginzberg notes, however, (Legends V p.79 n.22), אָנִיָּם in the rabbinic texts does not mean lifeless, but only soulless.



413. Iren. adv.haer. I 30, 6 (Harvey I 232f.). Epiphanius' account of the Ophites, generally similar but not entirely parallel to that of Irenaeus (on this see Schottroff, Der Glaubende, pp.82-6), stresses the attempt of Ialdabaoth to keep his offspring in ignorance of the heavenly world, and has them create man  
 ΚΑΤΑ ΤΗΝ ΙΔΕΑΝ of their father (Pan. XXXVII 4,1; Holl 2,55.17ff.). On Nous as the divine element and gift by which the elect are saved cf. Poim. CH I 21-22.
414. However, in I 30,9 (Harvey I 235f.) we find traces of a tradition much closer to that in the Hypostasis: here the creator (sic) of Adam and Eve appears to have given them only a worldly (i.e. psychic?) insufflation, so that on being cast out of Paradise they declined from original light (spiritual?) bodies to much grosser ones and their souls also became sluggish. They required a whiff of the trace of light from Sophia to revive them.
415. Other texts which have some bearing on this theme are:  
 (1) SJC BG 119,2 - 121,6. Here a drop descends from the light and the Spirit into the lower regions of the Pantocrator of chaos to ensure that he reveals their moulded forms (πλάσσει - a reference to Gen. 2: 7?) from that drop, as a judgement on him. The drop does this through the breath for (or into?) a living soul (Gen. 2: 7). The soul was shrunken and asleep in oblivion, but when it was warmed through the breath of the male light, he (Adam?) was able to name all creatures (Gen. 2: 19f.). This is all part of Sophia's plan to have the immortal Man collect the scattered elements (pieces of a garment) and the robbers (archons) suffer condemnation. Behind this allusive account one can readily detect a version of events similar to those in AJ, OnOrWld and NatArch. The descent of light into the realm of the Demiurge causes the formation of the moulded creature in which there is a dormant soul. This is awakened by the male light being inbreathed (by the Demiurge?). As a result Adam is enabled to name all creation, this being all part of a heavenly plan to rescue the trapped element and end the state of deficiency. (2) the Mandaean anthropogony in R.Ginza III (Lidzbarski pp.107-111; Rudolph "Grundtyp", pp.9-13). Ptahil, the Demiurge, says to the seven planets: "Let us create Adam so that he be king of the world". They confer and say: "Come, we will create Adam and Eve as head of the whole family". Adam is created without a soul and cannot stand. The planets ask Ptahil to cast some of his spirit (ruha) into Adam. This is tried but is unsuccessful (cf. NatArch

CG II 88,3-6). Ptahil ascends to his father, informs him of his failure, and his father thereupon gives him the great Mana (i.e. the inner man) wrapped in a turban. This, Rudolph argues (op.cit., p.12), presupposes that Adam is the image of Ptahil and consequently of Ptahil's father. Three helpers, Hibil, Sitil and Anoš, are commissioned in the meantime by the supreme deity to guard the soul and not let Ptahil know how it enters the body. When Ptahil is about to insert the soul into the Tibil (i.e. the Golem), the Redeemer removes it from his pocket and himself raises Adam and makes him breathe the breath of life (Gen. 2: 7?). Neither text explicitly refers to the image-motif, but both have a version of the Golem theme which interprets man's soul or the psychic element as the work of the Demiurge which requires the divine spirit for its awakening, i.e. redemption. Traces of the Golem motif may also be detected in (3) Zos. On the letter Omega §12 (Scott-Ferguson IV 107.11-15). When Light-Man was in Paradise and inbreathed ( ? δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ μὲνους ) by Fate (i.e. the Demiurge?), he was persuaded as ἀκκός and ἀνεψύχητος to put on their (the archons'?) Adam, the one from Fate, made from the four elements, and was thus trapped in it. There appear to be echoes of Gen. 2: 7 in all these three texts. Finally, there is (4) Justin's Baruch in Hipp. Ref. V 26,7-9 (Wendland 127.27 - 128.9) particularly if, with Schenke (Gott "Mensch", p.96), we presuppose that man is made in the image of Elohim (i.e. Gen. 1: 26). Certainly the basis of Justin's allegorical interpretation is Gen. 1 and 2, as he himself admits: he is presenting the true understanding of the "veiled language" of Moses. He presents Adam as created by the twelve angels of Elohim of the finest parts of Eden. (in the image of Elohim, so Schenke). Eden sets in him her soul (an echo of Gen. 1: 24?) and Elohim his spirit (Gen. 2: 7?). Adam is thus the symbol of the marriage of heaven and earth. Eve is made in the same way, an image and symbol (of Adam, so Schenke), a seal of Eden. In her, the image, was set also a soul from Eden and spirit from Elohim. Like so many of the Gnostic systems we have examined, Justin's presents a three-fold scheme of choic, psychic and pneumatic (V 27,3), but for him the basic battle is between soul and spirit, rather than matter and spirit, and unlike other Gnostics, e.g. the Valentinians, he insists that both soul and spirit are present in all men.

416. Schottroff, *op.cit.*, p.34f., argues that the simplest form of the Golem motif occurs in those texts where the Demiurge is not involved in the animation, in that the original animation of the Golem had no relation to the God of the OT. However, in the Jewish form of the motif God is indissolubly connected with the animation of the Golem. Once the animation by God (Gen. 2: 7) formed a second stage to the angelic creation of man's body (Gen. 1: 26) it would be easy for Gnostics to make this animation the work of the unknown God, reintroducing Gen. 2: 7 to explain the origin of man's psyche. As it stands, Saturninus' two-stage version does not work.
417. Cf. GTr CG I 30,17-23; Schottroff, *Der Glaubende*, pp.29f. On the motif of the Redeemer awakening man from his oblivion and raising him up cf. NatArch CG II 89,11-15; OnOrWld CG II 115,30 - 116,3; AJ CG II 31,1-25.
418. For Philo's interpretation see above nn.184 and 270. For the rabbis' two-stage view cf. *Gen.R.* VIII, 11; XII, 8; XIV, 3. On Adam as a symbol of the marriage of heaven and earth cf. *Baruch*, Hipp. Ref. V 26,7f. (Wendland 127.27 - 128.3).
419. Cf. *Gen.R.* VIII,1; XIV,8; *b Sanh.* 38b. The Mandeans in *L. Ginza* X (Lidzbarski 454f.) represent the spirit (*Mana*) as descending to the bodily trunk which lacks limbs, cannot stand and merely crawls. However, Schottroff is probably justified when she claims (*Der Glaubende*, p.41) that the Jewish material alone is not sufficient to explain the Gnostic mythologoumenon.
420. Cf. *b Sanh.* 38b; *ARN* 17b.
421. On angelic hostility cf. *Gen.R.* VIII,3-6; on their worshipping Adam cf. *Gen.R.* VIII,10. The stages in man's animation recall the *Untitled Treatise* and Saturninus (see n.332), and the angelic worship the archons' praise of Adam in OnOrWld CG II 115, 23-5.
422. *Der Glaubende*, pp.9-12, 36-8.
423. AJ BG 48,17 - 50,6; CG III 22,9 - 23,7; CG II 15,5-23; CG IV 23,20 - 24,14.
424. BG 50,6 - 51,1; CG III 23,7-19; CG II 19,2-15. The long version gives an extremely detailed account of the activity of 365 angels over against the very brief summary in the short version which involves only 360.

425. BG 54,11 - 55,13 = CG III 26,6-25 = CG II 20,33 - 31,13  
= CG IV 32,7-27.
426. NatArch CG II 87,24-33.
427. In BG 48,6ff. and CG III 22,1ff. it is the whole archonship  
(ἀρχοντική) of the powers which sees the image and decides  
to make man. This is not so evident from the long recension.
428. BG 48,17 - 49,6 = CG III 22,9-14. Despite the lacunae in  
both versions this seems to be the sense.
429. CG II 15,5-11 = CG IV 23,20-8. "From his" appears to make  
more sense. CG IV 23,26 reads  $\tau\epsilon\psi\chi\iota\kappa\eta$  which  
Krause interprets (as with the  $\tau\epsilon\psi\chi\iota\kappa\eta$  of CG II 15,9)  
to mean the soul.
430. BG 49,6-9 = CG III 22,14-18; CG II 15,11-13 = CG IV 23,29 -  
24,1. Giversen may be right to argue that the long recension  
is more original (*Apocryphon*, p.243), not on the grounds he  
adduces, viz. that the short is anticipating future events, but  
because the possession of the name was thought to give the  
possessor control over the power of the entity named. The  
short recension has mistakenly associated the power with the  
name rather than with the light.
431. BG 49,9 - 50,4; CG III 22,18-23,6; CG II 15,13-23; CG IV  
24,2-15. CG III 23,4 has "tooth" ( $\psi\alpha\lambda$ ) instead of "skin"  
( $\psi\alpha\lambda\epsilon$ ) and CG II 15,23 = CG IV 24,14 have "eyelid"  
( $\psi\alpha\lambda\epsilon$  and  $\psi\alpha\lambda\epsilon$ ) instead of "hair" ( $\psi\alpha\lambda$ ). Both  
mistakes are readily explicable. On the list of powers, see  
above pp.172ff.
432. Cf. CG II 12,15-25 = CG IV 19,15-26.
433. Cf. BG 43,11 - 44,4. For an extremely similar if not quite  
identical list cf. OnOrg Wld CG II 101,26-34.
434. See above pp.174f.
435. Lib.Schol. XI (Pognon pp.132, 195f.).
436. See above p.175 n. 174. Audi's version, which Theodore  
says he got from the Chaldeans, might reflect an earlier stage  
of our Apocryphon.

437. OnOrWld CG II 114,29-35.
438. 114,36 - 115,1.
439. The text makes this point no less than four times: 115,5. 10. 13f.34.
440. Cf. Gnosis, I pp.181-5; The Gnostic Religion, pp.156-69.
441. Cf. BG 41,16 - 42,10 and parr.; 43,6 - 44,9 and parr.
442. Zatspram 30,5-11.
443. R.C. Zaehner, Zurvan, p.162 n.2.
444. CH I, 9, 16. The negative side of their planetary nature is evident in 25 where they are described as  $\xi\omega\upsilon\alpha\iota$ . Cf. Servius in Aen. VI, 714, and Origen's description of the descent of the Gnostic through the 7 planetary spheres in c.Cels VI, 31 (Koetschau 100,31 - 102,4).
445. CH I, 9, 25.
446. AJ BG 72,2-12 and parr.
447. R.Ginza III (Lidzbarski 108.4ff.).
448. 15,23-9; BG 50,6-14 appears to omit a phrase. On  $\psi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\eta$   $\xi\pi\acute{o}\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$  cf. Ptolemeans in Iren. adv.haer. I 5,4 (Harvey I 46).
449. BG 50,11-14 = CG III 23,12-14.
450. CG II 15,29 - 19,2 = CG IV 24,21 - 29,4.
451. Giversen, Apocryphon, p.281, assumes that it was added by the redactor of CG II as does Kasser, RThPh 14 (1964)p.144. On this see Introduction, pp.13ff.
452. Apocryphon, pp.245-52.
453. CG II 18,34f. This seems a more appropriate translation for the Coptic  $\bar{\text{N}}\tau\upsilon\gamma\ \Lambda\iota\kappa\text{H}\ \bar{\text{N}}\psi\gamma\chi\text{H}$  than Giversen's "psychic matter" (op.cit., p.81).

454. 19,2-6.
455. 19,10-12.
456. Exc.ex Theod. 46,1 (Sagnard 156): 50,1 - 55,1 (Sagnard 162-170). Cf. Iren.adv.haer. I 5,5 - 6,1 (Harvey I 49,5). The Gnostics attacked by Plotinus had a theory of two souls, the divine soul and the soul of the four material elements (Enn. II 9,5).
457. Whether Valentinianism was the source or the borrower is not clear. But the fact that the long recension got the details of the demons' names from a Book of Zoroastros (CG II 19, 6-10) suggests the use of an existing source and perhaps strengthens the possibility that Valentinianism was the borrower.
458. On the different origins of the numbers see above pp.154-9.
459. Pan. XXIV 7,6 (Holl 1,264.15-18).
460. PS Book III ch.132 (Schmidt-MacDermot 340.15f.).
461. Hipp.Ref. V 7, 6 (Wendland 80.9).
462. AJ BG 50,15 - 54,11 and parr. This appears to be a variant of the motif of the divine pity on the Golem made in the divine likeness, found in Saturninus, Iren. adv.haer. I 24,1 (Harvey I 197). Schottroff argues (op.cit., pp.9-12, 88ff.) that each of the heavenly interventions is to be interpreted as a redemptive act. Thus the same single event, the redemption of the Gnostic, is presented as a series of connected episodes. However, she does not satisfactorily explain why this narrative form is so frequently adopted. Adam is not in fact precisely identical with the Gnostic, and the latter was not a modern existentialist in ancient garb - the primal "history" was believed to explain, but not be identical with, man's present situation. The subsequent course of history, as a series of moves and counter-moves by divine and anti-divine forces, illuminated the Gnostic's present dilemma, that although he was conscious of his divine origin, he knew himself to be still trapped in the world of matter and the senses, capable of salvation, yet requiring a Redeemer.
463. BG 54,16 and CG III 26,10 add "flame", which CG II 21,1 omits, probably on the basis that fire has already been mentioned.



464. Giversen, op.cit., p.258, points out the parallel with the elements presided over by the four daemons in 18,2ff. (heat, cold, moisture, dryness). As these latter form the basis of the "material" (ὕλικός) body and its passions, so the earthly elements here form the basis of the fleshly body. A similar connection is explicit in the Ptolemaean cosmogony: the corporeal elements of the universe spring from the passions, fear, sorrow, perplexity; earth from terror, water from fear, air from sorrow, fire being inherent in all (Iren.adv.haer. I 5,4: Harvey I 46-9). The four elements in the long recension (CG II 18,6-18) can be linked with the following four passions, to present a picture similar to the Ptolemaean scheme - hot, cold, dry, moist; lust, desire, pain, fear. The Mother, matter, mingles with them all as fire does in the Ptolemaean account.
465. BG 54,11 - 55,15; CG III 26,6 - 27,1; CG II 20,33 - 21,14; CG IV 32,7-27.
466. Cf. Book of the Rolls (ed. Gibson), p.5f.; Schatzhöhle (ed. Bezold), p.3.
467. Cf. Zos. On the Letter Omega, §11 (Scott-Ferguson IV p.106.24 - 107.1); 12 (p.107.13f.); Olympiodorus in Berthelot p.89 (quoted in Scott-Ferguson, op.cit., p.122).
468. Ibid., 12 (Scott-Ferguson p.107.11-15). Here we have Light-Adam, Fate (i.e. the Demiurge?) inbreathing him (Gen. 2: 7?), the archontic creation of earthly Adam from the four elements and the trapping of immobile (ἀνεκίνητος ?) Light-Adam in the earthly creature. If indeed we do have traces of the Golem motif as regards the last point, here it is interpreted in rather a different way from the Naassene version: it is not the earthly creature who clothes the heavenly Man who is the Golem, but the latter. In AJ BG 72,2-12 and parr., Fate (ἐξμυρμένη) is produced by the Demiurge and the archons, while in Poim. CH I,9 the administration of the seven Governors of the planetary circles is called Fate (ἐξμυρμένη).
469. Tim. 42E-43A.
470. De opif. 146.



471. Adv.haer. I 30,9 (Harvey I 235f.). This account cannot be harmonised satisfactorily with 30,6 (Harvey I 233), according to which the six powers created Adam and Ialdabaoth inbreathed his trace of light, whereby man was saved. The present section clearly represents a different tradition, but one equally influenced by Jewish ideas. See following note.
472. ApocAd CG V 64,6 - 67,14. On the glory of Adam lost at the fall see nn.179 and 180. On the separation of Adam and Eve cf. GPh CG II 70,9-22.
473. Cf. Exc.ex Theod. 55,1 - 56,2 (Sagnard 170-2).
474. Thus NatArch CG II 89,11-17,31ff.; 90,12; OnOrWld CG II 113,21 - 114,15; 115,30 - 116,8 and AJ BG 53,4-10 and parr. deal in their own characteristic ways with the figure of the spiritual woman, Zoe or Eve, who awakens Adam and instructs him.
475. BG 58,10 - 60,16; CG III 28,25 - 30,14; CG II 22,18 - 23,24; CG IV 35,9 - 36,17.
476. Adv.haer. I 30,7 (Harvey I 233).
477. The long recension is clearly preferable here since it alone makes it plain that the Demiurge took some power from the man. Otherwise the mention of the rib would be meaningless. The Valentinians understood the creation of Eve from Adam as the removal from him of the whole female seed, from which all the females derived, as the males did from Adam (Exc.ex Theod. 21,2: Sagnard 98). In the Poimandres (CH I, 18f.) the division of the original androgyne leads to the triumph of ἐρως and the processes of generation and death. In ApocAd CG V 64,20-28, Adam and Eve, once separated by God, lose their glory and knowledge and come under the sway of death.
478. NatArch CG II 89,3-11. On Adam's sleep as the oblivion of the soul cf. Exc.ex Theod. 2,2 (Sagnard 56).
479. Hypostasis pp.75-80.
480. 89,11-17.

481. 89,31 - 90,12.
482. OnOrWld CG II 115,30 - 116,25'. On the archontic attempt to ravish Eve cf. NatArch 89,17-31; Audi's "Book of the Requests" and "Book of the Aliens" in Theodore bar Konai, Lib.Schol. XI (Pognon pp.133 and 196).
483. 116,33 - 117,15. This appears to be a version of the myth of the ravishing of Eve which occurs in various forms: Iren. adv.haer. I 30,7 (Harvey I 233f.) has the powers ravish Eve out of lust and produce the angels; the Apocryphon (BG 62,3 - 63,2 and parr.) has Ialdabaoth ravish Eve and beget Iave and Elohim (i.e. Cain and Abel). Characteristically the long recension (CG II 24,13-15 = CG IV 37,23-6) has Pronoia remove Zoe from Eve before this occurs, just as in the Ophite version in Irenaeus Prunicus removes the light power. Epiphanius' Archontics (Pan. XL 5,3; Holl 2,82.13ff.) have the Devil beget Cain and Abel by Eve. Cf. Targ. Ps. Jon. (TJ I) on Gen. 4:1; 5:3; PRE 21 etc. On this see Ginzberg, Legends, V p.133f. n.3; Bullard Hypothesis, p.84. In the Baruch of Justin (Hipp. Ref. V 26,23), Naas, the angel of Edem committed adultery with Eve, a theme found in rabbinic tradition, cf. b. Shabb. 146a; b. Yeb. 103b; b. A.Z. 22b.
484. Under this heading I include Exc. ex Theod. 21,1-3 and GPh CG II 70,9-22.
485. Seth, of course, is particularly associated with a special race in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic traditions. See on this A.F.J. Klijn, Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature (Supplements to Numen XLVI), Leiden 1977.



## CHAPTER FOUR

Gnostic Soteriology

If we wish to know what second century Gnostics understood by salvation (as opposed to twentieth century interpretations and hypotheses) we can do no better than turn to the famous passage preserved in Clement of Alexandria's Excerpta ex Theodoto (78, 1-2). Up till baptism, says Clement, the Valentinians assert that Fate (εἰμαρμένη) is true; after it the astrologers are no longer in the truth. However, he goes on, it is not baptism alone which sets us free but also the knowledge (γνῶσις) who were we? what have we become? where were we? where have we been cast? whither are we hastening? from where are we being redeemed? what is birth (γέννησις), what re-birth (ἀναγέννησις)? That is, it is a knowledge which tells us who we really are and frees us from our present state of ignorance and imprisonment in an alien body and hostile world governed by Fate. Salvation is gnosis in this special sense and its cosmic and metaphysical implications are summed up most concisely in the Marcosian formula reproduced by Irenaeus: "The perfect redemption is said to be the knowledge of the ineffable Greatness. From ignorance both deficiency and passion arise; through 'knowledge' will the entire substance derived from ignorance be destroyed. Therefore this 'knowledge' is redemption of the inner man."<sup>1</sup> This finds a precise echo in the Gospel of Truth from the Jung Codex.<sup>2</sup> And the soteriological significance of knowledge, especially of self-knowledge, is not limited

to Christian-gnostic documents. In the Poimandres God proclaims: "let man who has Nous recognise himself as immortal",<sup>3</sup> and Poimandres himself continues, "If then you learn that you consist of life and light and that you come from these, you will go back to life."<sup>4</sup> Finally one could illustrate this theme from a Gnostic work with no apparent Christian traces, the Apocalypse of Adam. At one point it reads: "But those who reflect upon the knowledge of the eternal God in their hearts will not perish."<sup>5</sup> Salvation, then, is special knowledge of one's true self, of one's kinship or consubstantiality with the unknown transcendent God and of the true nature of the visible world.

But then how do we come to this knowledge? It is certainly not got by rational investigation and philosophical enquiry;<sup>6</sup> it is religious knowledge; it has ethical connotations and above all it is a matter of revelation. Thus although it might appear from the Poimandres that all men in that they possess Nous can save themselves - the conclusion drawn by the recipient of the revelation - this is explicitly denied: the heavenly Nous, the saving revelation is only near those who by their conduct deserve it, and who are thereby enabled to perceive the truth.<sup>7</sup> Saving gnosis is thus revelation from above or outside. It can be summed up by the frequent Gnostic motif of the "call" which W. Foerster would see as the kernel of Gnosis,<sup>8</sup> which comes to the Gnostic self (or spirit or divine spark) trapped in matter, "drunkenness" "oblivion", and awakens it so that it is enabled to recognise its true

heavenly nature and escape from imprisonment in the body and in matter.<sup>9</sup> Contrary to the arguments of G. Quispel<sup>10</sup> and C. Colpe,<sup>11</sup> salvation for the Gnostic would not appear to be simply or principally a matter of self-redemption.

Our illustrations have given some idea of the fallen state of the Gnostic from which he must be redeemed, and we can fill in details of some of the chief concepts which characterise the Gnostic vision of the Fall and salvation as isolated by H. Jonas<sup>12</sup> and J. Zandee,<sup>13</sup> and which we shall be examining in our analysis of the Apocryphon, Irenaeus adversus haereses I 30 and related texts. Thus our fallen state can be described in terms of ignorance (as opposed to knowledge), deficiency (as opposed to being incorporeal and spiritual), oblivion, drunkenness, and sleep (as opposed to being awakened and sober), mortal (as opposed to being immortal), divided into sexes (as opposed to being undivided, androgynous or asexual), subject to eros and the passions (as opposed to being impassible), governed by Fate (as opposed to being free), enslaved and led astray by the ignorant Demiurge of this visible world and his counterfeit spirit (as opposed to being kingless and indwelt by the spirit of life and truth) and finally, being subject to earthly generation (as opposed to being spiritually regenerated). These categories, of course, are directly related to the questions of Exc. ex Theod. 78,2, and, as we shall see, one of the purposes of the Heilsgeschichte of the Apocryphon and Irenaeus

adv.haer. I 30 is precisely to account for their existence.

If then we are unable to save ourselves and need revelation and redemption from outside, does that mean that gnosis is something entirely new, a matter of sheer divine grace, as Quispel has argued, appealing to a statement of Tertullian about Valentinianism?<sup>14</sup> This would certainly go against the traditional interpretation of Valentinian (and a fortiori of Gnostic) soteriology, found both in the Church Fathers who combatted Gnosticism and in modern scholars like R. Bultmann, which seized upon the Gnostic claim that they were being saved by nature ( φύσει σωζόμενος ) as the key to understanding their view of salvation as essentially determinist.<sup>15</sup> It would also tend to contradict what we have argued is a fundamental idea in Gnostic theology, viz. the consubstantiality of God and the divine element in man - if the saving knowledge be interpreted as recognition of one's essential heavenly nature. However this deterministic interpretation of salvation as a matter of nature and substance has recently been attacked, particularly by L. Schottroff, who has argued on the basis of an analysis of the Apocalypse of Adam and the Valentinian concept of φύσει σωζόμενος that the salvandus is not assured of salvation as a substance, that it is rather a matter of grace and free will: the indicative of salvation is balanced by an imperative.<sup>16</sup> The idea of salvation by nature or substance she ascribes to an inaccurate polemic on the part of the heresiologists. However the



idea does occur in the Tripartite Tractate from the Jung Codex,<sup>17</sup> and more recently E. Pagels has argued on the basis of an analysis of Valentinian exegesis of Romans that both the traditional view and that of Schottroff and others are misleading since they are cast in terms of the antithesis free will - determinism, rather than that of an experience of election through grace which Pagels finds as the basis of the three nature conception of the Valentinians.<sup>18</sup>

In fact the Church Fathers have preserved alongside this concept of substance or nature the ideas that education or training is necessary even for the pneumatics,<sup>19</sup> and that the pneumatics are sown as seed, both of which suggest the paradox of Gnostic salvation that although the pneumatics are assured by the grace of revelation that they are by nature elect and divine, yet their salvation (in terms of formation and perfection) is not yet complete and will not be until the consummation (ἡ περὶ τῆς τελειότητος).<sup>20</sup> The Untitled Treatise from Codex II concludes by saying that "each one by his deed (ἡ πράξις) and his knowledge will reveal his nature".<sup>21</sup> We shall have to examine what our texts have to say about this question of nature and grace.

If salvation is to be understood in terms of the awakening call, the saving revelation, allowing us to do what we cannot do of ourselves, i.e. recognise our essential divine nature, this implies a revealer or redeemer. It has been argued recently that Gnosticism has no need

for a redeemer, being essentially a religion of self-recognition and that a redeemer was first introduced under the impact of Christianity.<sup>22</sup> H.-M. Schenke has convincingly argued that this presupposes too limited a view of the nature and role of a redeemer and he contends that there is practically no Gnostic work or system without a Gnostic redeemer in some form as an integral element, from the concrete historical figure of Simon Magus at one extreme to the abstract concept of the "call" at the other.<sup>23</sup> K. Rudolph has reinforced this argument by pointing out that the ancient concept of "redeemer" corresponds more to the term "liberator" or "rescuer" and that this precisely describes the Gnostic redeemer whose infinite variety he has charted.<sup>24</sup>

This at once raises the very vexed question of the existence of a pre-Christian redeemer myth, conceived in terms of a "redeemed redeemer" or salvator salvatus or salvandus.<sup>25</sup> We do not intend to get involved in this enormous and hotly-debated subject but shall have to ask what light our texts can throw on the questions thus raised about the Christianization of originally non-Christian texts, and about the nature of the redeemer or redeemers (e.g. are they essential? are they in any sense to be identified with Primal Man? do they correspond to the categories "redeemed redeemer" or salvator salvatus etc.?). S. Arai for example has argued that all sections in the Apocryphon in which Christ appears must be considered interpolations,

and L. Schottroff would see the revelation discourse at the end of the long recension (CG II 30, 11-31, 25 = CG IV 46, 23-49, 6) as not an original part of the work but containing the concept of a Gnostic redeemer independent of Christianity who has been secondarily identified with Christ.<sup>27</sup> H.-M. Schenke too would see in the subject of the revelation discourse in the long version of the Apocryphon and in the figure of Sophia in Irenaeus adv. haer. I 30, 3-11a the outline of the non-Christian redeemer as the heavenly Mother saving her children.<sup>28</sup>

Finally there is the question of when salvation takes place. If we take the concept of the "call" as central, this might lead us to conceive of the Gnostic understanding of salvation as essentially timeless, or in other words existential, as indeed Schottroff has argued, appealing to the inconsistencies in the Gnostic Heilsgeschichte.<sup>29</sup> But the recourse to existentialist analysis as the hermeneutical key to unlock the mysteries of Gnosis, however valuable it has been, is open to the charge of anachronism. Furthermore the very frequency of Gnostic texts with a Heilsgeschichte beginning with Adam and incorporating a threefold system of ages, advents of the Saviour etc., does suggest that history does have some importance for the Gnostic as the locus of revelation. Schenke has argued that for the Gnostics redemption and a redeemer existed from the beginning of human history and that the redeemer has therefore a double task; original revelation

and continuous revelation throughout history. He appeals to Manichean and Mandeian evidence to demonstrate that this concept is independent of Christianity, post- as well as pre-Christian.<sup>30</sup>

This Gnostic redeemer-concept whether in its basic structure or in its various concrete forms has, according to Schenke, at times influenced the development of early Christian Christology in that Jesus is either seen as the bearer of continuous revelation or as the primal redeemer.<sup>31</sup> Rudolph suggests a two-sided process whereby on the one hand Gnostic concepts were Christianized while on the other Christian views were Gnosticized; Gnostic redeemer-concepts were historicized and the Christian figure of Christ mythologized.<sup>32</sup> We shall also have to consider how appropriate this scheme is for our texts, and whether we should not include the idea of a decisive revelation as a fundamental component of the Gnostic world view, without which the ideas of primal and continuous revelation do not make sense. Thus it is perhaps significant that besides two Gnostic texts from Nag Hammadi which are generally classed as Christianized, the Apocryphon of John and the Gospel of the Egyptians, there are two works generally adjudged to be non- and even pre-Christian, the Apocalypse of Adam and the Paraphrase of Shem, all four of which seem to visualise a triple descent of the heavenly redeemer/revealer in world history, the third occasion involving presence in the flesh in the context of spiritual as opposed to (defective and evil) baptism

in water.<sup>33</sup> All four also share the idea of the heavenly seed or race which survives the various vicissitudes and archontic attacks in the course of history.<sup>34</sup> It may be that such ideas are best explained in terms of existing Christian speculations about Christ and his revelation(s) in history and about the Christians as not a recent phenomenon but as a superior or spiritual race going back to Adam.<sup>35</sup>

In enquiring about the soteriological views of the Apocryphon, Irenaeus adv. haer. I 30, and other related texts, we shall have to ask what understanding of salvation is present (is knowledge in the sense of revelation an adequate definition?), what is the subject or object of salvation (i.e. the whole man, the soul or the spirit), how salvation comes (i.e. is it a matter of nature and/or grace), what picture of a saviour or saviours emerges, and finally when does salvation take place.

#### The Gnostic interpretation of the Genesis primal history

As we have already indicated, the Gnostic Paradise accounts are best interpreted as soteriological: they explain the origin and (hence) the nature of man's present plight but point to the presence of divine redeeming activity in terms of a kind of Gnostic Heilsgeschichte. Thus different motifs in the early chapters of Genesis are selected by the various documents to delineate man's situation and isolate the

activity of various redeemer figures. Differences in selection, order, interpretation etc., are therefore to be ascribed to different theological aims and tendencies (where they are evidently not the result of errors in transmission). But it may also be possible to discern certain common elements, tendencies and influences which do not appear in earlier (or later) stages of Gnosticism, as far as these can be traced, and which may permit us to sketch certain interconnections and groupings within the texts.

#### The original soteriological impulse

Both the Apocryphon and the Ophites of Irenaeus' account initiate the process of saving the divine power present in the Demiurge with the creation of man: he is not simply an archontic device to retain the divine light<sup>36</sup> or avert the threat of destruction posed by heavenly light - Adam,<sup>37</sup> rather he is the chosen instrument of the divine plan to recover the imprisoned divine element<sup>38</sup> and pass judgment on the archons for their ignorance and audacity.<sup>39</sup> But whereas in the Ophite system it is Sophia herself who initiates the creation of man by giving the archons the concept of Man to empty them of the heavenly power,<sup>40</sup> in the Apocryphon the figure who reveals herself to the archons in the form of heavenly Man is not Sophia, who in the Apocryphon is increasingly relieved of any positive soteriological function as Schottroff has convincingly demonstrated, but the Metropator, to whom Sophia prays when she wishes to recover

the power she gave her offspring.<sup>41</sup>

In the short recension of the Apocryphon at this point it is to the Father of the All, the merciful, the light God to whom Sophia prays, but there are good reasons for thinking that the long recension is more original here. Giversen thinks that the title "Metropator" here and at CG II 20, 9f. and 27, 33f. applies to the primordial Father while in the other three instances (5, 6f.; 6, 16; 14, 19) it refers to Barbelo, although he notes that the same designation can be used of both since Barbelo emanates from the Father.<sup>42</sup> But it is clearly Barbelo as Mother-Father (thus and not Grossvater as Krause translates Μητροπατωρ) who is the primary redeemer figure. It is clearly she who appears in the form of First Man to the archons. She is designated as "holy .... the perfect, the perfect Pronoia" in the long recension (CG II 14, 19f.), the counterpart in the short referring to the holy perfect Father who is also described as "blessed" (μακάριος ; BG 48, 1-4). The same adjective is applied to the Metropator in CG II 20, 9f. and the Father in the parallel in BG 52, 17f. (= CG III 24, 25f.) where it is accompanied by the further designations "beneficent" (φειλόμενος) and "merciful" (ἐλεημι; CG II 20, 10 and CG III 25, 1 read ὡς ἀνθρώπου as CG IV 31, 5 also appears to). In our present passage the short recension describes the Father as "rich in mercy" (ἐλεημι ; BG 51, 6 = CG III 23, 23) and the long the Metropator as "the one of great mercy" (ὁ πᾶσι τῶν ἐλεημι ;



CG II 19,18). That these titles and designations are more appropriate to Barbelo than <sup>to</sup> the supreme transcendent invisible spirit and that Metropator may have been the original reading is confirmed by the description in BG 71, 6f. of the Mother as "rich in mercy" (ΝΑΥΕ ΠΕCΝΔ ) where CG II 27, 33f. describes the Metropator in the same way ( ΠΕΤΝΔΥΕ ΠΕCΝΔΕ ).<sup>43</sup> She/he is associated with the holy Spirit, the "merciful" (BG 71, 7f. ΝΑΗΤ; CG II 27,35 ΠΥΔΝΖΤΗΥ), who, according to the long recension " <is> in every form" (CG II 27,35 = CG IV 43,10), and is further identified with the Epinoia of light (BG 71,8ff.; CG III 36,22; CG II 28,1f.; CG IV 43,12f.). As we shall see, the Epinoia of light is the primary revealer and redeemer in the main body of the Apocryphon.

Now in a later passage in the long recension (CG II 20,14ff.) the Metropator sends out through his beneficent (ΡΕΥΡ̄ΠΕΤΝΔΝΟΥΥ) and merciful ( ΠΕΤΝΔΥΕ ΠΕCΝΔ ) spirit an Epinoia of light, who is identified as "Zoe", to help Adam, work at the spiritual seed and restore the Mother's deficiency.

The corresponding passage in the short recension (BG 53,4-54,4 = CG III 25,6-23) suggests that the good and merciful spirit, rather than being an attribute or instrument, is in fact the figure sent out, namely the Epinoia of light. This interpretation appears to be confirmed by the passage previously cited (BG 71,7ff. and parr.): the beneficent and merciful spirit is in fact the holy Spirit, the

Epinoia of light, the Metropator's agent in redemption, sharing his/her attributes. Furthermore the holy Spirit who alone saw Sophia concealing her abortive offspring is called "Zoe, the mother of all" according to BG 38, 10-12.<sup>44</sup> The holy Spirit, the Epinoia of light, and Zoe are one and the same.

Finally there is the very abrupt and unexplained statement near the end of the short recension (BG 75, 10-13 = CG III 39, 11-13), at the point where the revelation discourse of the Pronoia occurs in the long, that "the blessed one, the Father-Mother (  $\tau\mu\delta\delta\gamma\bar{\nu}\epsilon\iota\omega\tau$  i.e. the  $\mu\eta\tau\rho\sigma\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\rho$  ? ) who is rich in mercy (  $\nu\alpha\psi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\kappa\nu\alpha$  ) takes (or took? BG 75, 12 has  $\epsilon\epsilon\lambda\iota$  ; CG III 39, 12 reads  $\nu\alpha\epsilon\epsilon$  [  $\lambda\iota$  ? ] i.e. will [take] ) form (  $\mu\sigma\rho\phi\acute{\eta}$  ) in her offspring (  $\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha$  )." This seems to suggest that Barbelo herself was, is, or will be present as redeemer in her offspring (the Gnostics?), disguised in their form, and that the figure of the holy Spirit, the Epinoia of light, is simply a thin disguise or periphrasis of this dangerous idea. This seems to be confirmed by the revelation discourse of the long recension (CG II 30, 11-31, 25 = CG IV 46, 23-49, 1) in which the revealer identifies him/herself as the perfect Pronoia of the All (CG II 30, 11f.; cf. 6, 4f.; BG 27, 10f.), the thought of the virginal Spirit (CG II 31, 12f.; cf. 5, 16f.), who transformed herself in her offspring (  $\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha$  ; 30, 13). Barbelo herself is designated "holy Spirit" (CG II 5, 7f.). The figure of Barbelo, the Protennoia, in her triple advents and presence in all

creatures in the Trimorphic Protennoia from Codex XIII further illuminates the picture presented by the Apocryphon.<sup>45</sup> We shall have to consider the precise relationship of the two texts where they run parallel, but it may be worth remarking that in the former the Epinoia of light, far from being the redeemer/revealer, is identical with the guileless (ἀγνῆστον) Sophia who descends and produces the Demon Ialdabaoth and thereafter asks to be elevated.<sup>46</sup>

There is therefore some justification for the fruitful and ingenious suggestions of Janssens that the Epinoia of light, the holy Spirit and Sophia herself are one and the same.<sup>47</sup> However we would question the identification of the Epinoia with Sophia in the Apocryphon, although not, of course in the Trimorphic Protennoia, and would prefer to draw attention to the links between Pronoia/Barbelo and the Epinoia, which she herself has pointed to in her indication of the significance of the prepositions Pro(noiā) and Epi(noiā).<sup>48</sup> But if the Epinoia is not identical with Sophia, there are suggestions that she may well represent her consort. First of all there is the odd mention in CG II 9,25 of the Sophia of Epinoia,<sup>49</sup> which at least suggests some direct connection. Secondly there are three passages concerning the descent of a consort or helper to correct the deficiencies of Sophia which point to the Epinoia as the figure concerned. In the first of these (BG 47,1-13 = CG III 21,5-16; CG II 14,5-13 = CG IV 22,5-15), while the short recension relates the shedding of a holy spirit on

Sophia by the invisible Spirit and the descent of her consort to correct her deficiencies (CG III 21,9 has the, as we shall see, significant reading "their deficiencies"), the long recension, which is divided and confused, appears to deny that her consort did descend, insisting rather that (something?) came through the Pleroma to correct her deficiency. The second passage (BG 53,4-54,4 = CG III 25,6-23; CG II 20,14-28) deals with the mission of Adam's helper, the Epinoia of light, whom he named "Zoe" (CG II 20,18f. does not have Adam actually name her), and who labours to perfect creation, instruct it about the descent of its deficiency and its own ascent, and who finally helps correct the deficiency of the Mother (Sophia).<sup>50</sup>

The third passage is the very confused treatment of Adam's exclamation on recognising Eve (Genesis 2:23f.) and its interpretation (BG 59,21-60,16 = CG III 30,2-14; CG II 23,5-24 = CG IV 35,26-36,17). Adam's quotation of Genesis 2:24 about the man leaving his mother and father and uniting with his female partner, which follows his exclamation (Genesis 2:23) on being awakened by the Epinoia of light, is glossed by the short recension: "Because they will send (CG III 30,11: "they sent") the consort of the Mother and will raise her up (CG III 30,12 has "to correct her deficiencies"), therefore Adam called her "the Mother of all living (Gen. 3:20)". However the long recension, which again shows signs of confusion,<sup>51</sup> although referring to the future despatch of the consort, suddenly switches to insist that

it was Sophia who descended in innocence to correct her deficiency and that for this reason she was called "Zoe", i.e. "the mother of the living". That is, it identifies Sophia as Zoe, despite the earlier identifications of the holy Spirit with the mother of the living<sup>52</sup> and the Epinoia of light with Zoe.<sup>53</sup> Of course, as we have already noted, the holy Spirit and the Epinoia are identified with one another by the Apocryphon.<sup>54</sup>

Thus it would appear that, as indeed is appropriate, the consort of Sophia, who descends to correct her deficiencies, is also present as the Epinoia of light, perfecting Adam and the Gnostic race descended from him and Seth.<sup>55</sup> Her deficiencies are the Gnostics, in a sense, awaiting the descent of the Spirit of life to awaken, instruct and perfect them. Hence that revealing slip of the pen by the redactor of Codex III ("their deficiencies" for "her deficiencies" at 21,9). The simplest explanation for the confusion in our third passage is that the redactors (particularly of CG II and CG IV but also of BG) have not understood that the title "Mother of the living" properly applies to the Epinoia and not to Sophia. Such an understanding can perhaps still be discerned in the Codex III version.

Our analysis of the figures of the Metropator who initiates the process of salvation, the Epinoia of light, her agent, and Sophia whose deficiencies are perfected, has thus given us some insight into the soteriological structure of the Apocryphon. The interrelationship of

these figures and their virtual interchangeability is not only characteristic of Gnostic ways of thinking but may also recall the structure of the Ophite system which involves the supreme Mother, Holy Spirit, Christ her son, and the Sophia her daughter and the sister and consort of Christ, in the process of redemption.<sup>56</sup>

Ialdabaoth's inbreathing divine power into Adam

In the short recension the Mother, wishing to recover the power she had given the Protarchon in compulsive desire (πρωθυμικός), comes in innocence and makes her request to the Father.<sup>57</sup> The long recension<sup>58</sup> makes no mention of her motivation and since it appears to have suppressed any reference to the compulsive desire of Sophia<sup>59</sup> it would appear to be less original here. But it may have preserved a more original view in its mention of the Metropator sending out five lights (CG II 19, 18f. = CG IV 30, 1) over against BG 51, 8f. which speaks of the Father, the light God, sending out the Autogenes and the four lights, or CG III 23, 22-24, 3 which has the Father and the five lights addressed and a missing subject sent out with his four lights. Till rejected the reading of CG III 23, 28 "the five lights" since there were only four<sup>60</sup> and argued that the copyist of CG III must have read Π† (the abbreviation for ΠΝΟΥΤΕ) and understood it as Π†ΟΥ. Giversen rejects Till's argument because five lights have in fact been mentioned already, namely Christ and the four, although he admits that the misreading of Π† as

$\pi\tau\circ\gamma$  is possible.<sup>61</sup> However such a misreading by the redactor of CG III is not at all likely since he uses the abbreviation  $\pi\tau$  four times, the first, oddly enough, in the passage relating the origin of the four lights.<sup>62</sup> Again there is no parallel to the expression "light-God" of BG 51,7 apart from Till's reconstruction - on the basis of EG 51,7 - of BG 32,21-33,1, and Till himself admits that the use of the conjunction ( $\wedge\bar{\eta}$ ) with the phrase cannot mean, as it normally should, that the light-God is a separate entity, rather than another designation for the Father of the All, as he takes it.<sup>63</sup>

Thus CG II may well retain the original sense: the Mother prays to the (mother) Father and the five lights, i.e. Christ and the four. If the redactor or copyist of BG misunderstood the  $\pi\tau\circ\gamma$  (or  $\pi\tau$  ?) as  $\pi\tau\circ\gamma\tau\epsilon$  (or  $\pi\tau$  ) he might well, when faced with the following mention of the five lights being sent, which the long version has preserved, have changed this to the Autogenes and the four lights because he thought ( like Till! ) that only four had been mentioned. The reading of CG III 24,1f., "with his four lights" clearly presupposes a missing subject, which would most appropriately be the Autogenes with whom the four lights are most closely associated. This fact has been concealed by Krause who translates the absolute form  $\delta\epsilon\tau\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\circ\gamma$  ("he sent") as if it were status pronominalis ("he sent them"), which would properly be  $\delta\epsilon\tau\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\bar{\eta}\circ\gamma\circ\gamma$ .<sup>64</sup> Perhaps the redactor of CG III was similarly misled and imagining the four



lights, of whose existence he was already aware, to be distinct from the five lights just mentioned, dropped the reference to the Autogenes.<sup>65</sup> Thus whatever be the precise explanation of how the confusion in our texts arose, it would appear that in fact all three suggest that five lights were sent out. The redactor of the long recension may have omitted the original reference to the five lights as the object of the Mother's prayer because of haplography.

That the lights came in the guise (τύπος) of the angels of Ialdabaoth, as in the short recension,<sup>66</sup> is more satisfactory and appropriate to the ignorance of the Demiurge than that they descended to the region (τόπος) of his angels, as in the long.<sup>67</sup> When the helper is sent to Adam in the next episode, she is not said to descend,<sup>68</sup> and in any case why should the lights descend to the region of the angels of Ialdabaoth? Would it not have been more appropriate to have said to his region? The confusion of τύπος and τόπος is, as Giversen points out, not unusual in Coptic texts.<sup>69</sup>

Thus, in accordance with a holy plan or counsel, the Autogenes (who is Christ) and the four lights advise the Protarchon to breathe into the immobile body something of his spirit (πνεῦμα), which is the power of the Mother, thereby emptying him of it and causing Adam to move and become superior to the Demiurge and his archons.<sup>70</sup> We have here an evident allusion to Genesis 2: 7 LXX,<sup>71</sup> but with a characteristic, if not always conscious, Gnostic interpretation; the

Demiurge inbreathes spirit ( πνεῦμα ), not breath ( πνοή )  
as in the LXX.<sup>72</sup>

The long recension has one or two features which are not present in the short, but which may be explicable in terms of the theological tendency of its redactor. Thus it dwells on the ignorance of Ialdabaoth in this manoeuvre: "he did not know since he is in ignorance".<sup>73</sup> It goes on at once to detail how the power of the Mother went from Ialdabaoth into the psychic body which the archons had created in the heavenly image.<sup>74</sup> The odd and redundant mention in CG III 24, 11f. of the first archon may suggest that it, unlike BG, originally had a sentence like that in the long recension according to which the power of the Mother went from the first archon into the body of Adam, and that because of homoeoteleuton the first part was omitted. Although the version in BG is the most concise, it is slightly elliptical, and this may have led to the more expanded version in CG II which has laid further stress on the ignorance of the Demiurge, the psychic character of Adam's body and the fact that it was in the likeness of the First Man, i.e. the Metropator, whose initiative in the salvation process is made all the more comprehensible. Man in the divine image is the appropriate vehicle for the divine power.<sup>75</sup>

The Ophite system described by Irenaeus presents a similar general picture. To empty Ialdabaoth of the dew of light lest he rise up against heaven because of the power he has from Sophia Prunicus,

his mother, she has him breathe the spirit (spiritus, πνεῦμα) of life into the wriggling man. Thus Ialdabaoth is secretly emptied of power (i.e. the dew of light) and man thereby receives Nous and Enthymesis, the elements which are saved.<sup>76</sup> Of the Gnostics only the Valentinians appear to share this view of the Demiurge as the unwitting transmitter of the divine, but for them the "spirit of life" inbreathed by him is simply the psychic substance or psychic man consubstantial with him; the heavenly element is the seed in man sown simultaneously with his inbreathing by the Demiurge.<sup>77</sup> All three systems in fact distinguish between what the Demiurge contributes of his own nature and what is actually responsible for salvation. In the Apocryphon, the Demiurge is responsible for the power of the Mother which is later identified as the soul, the principle of biological and rational life, but which cannot save itself; it needs to be united with the spirit of life which is not a natural endowment but must descend.<sup>78</sup> The Ophite system appears to distinguish between the dew of light or power or rational intelligence (Nous and Enthymesis), which the Mother inserts into men via Ialdabaoth and can remove again at will,<sup>79</sup> and the "worldly inbreathing (insufflationem mundialem)" which is what Adam and Eve received from Ialdabaoth as his own proper contribution, namely the souls which are consubstantial with him.<sup>80</sup> In the Valentinian system of the followers of Ptolemaeus, the Demiurge inseminates the psychic man, consubstantial with himself, into the hylic man and simultaneously

sows the spiritual seed, which alone achieves the highest level of salvation.<sup>81</sup> Valentinus himself may be aware of this conception when he speaks of man, the creation of angels, speaking freely because of the one who had invisibly deposited in him seed of the substance above.<sup>82</sup>

The similarity of approach may be further evidence of the links between the Apocryphon, the Ophites of Irenaeus and the Valentinians and add more weight to the thesis of Irenaeus that the last developed from the "Gnostics" of Adversus haereses I 29 and 30. Indeed certain features of the Valentinian system or systems found in the Excerpta ex Theodoto and the fragments of Heracleon may themselves help to cast light on the Apocryphon's account at this point. If we ask what is the significance of the descent of the Autogenes and the four lights in the guise of the angels of Ialdabaoth - apart from the obvious point that such a disguise was <sup>an</sup> appropriate one - a pointer may emerge from the Valentinian speculations about the mediating role played by the angels of the Demiurge in the creation of psychic man and the insertion of the pneumatic seed into him. There appear to be two groups involved; (1) the psychic angels (or angels of the dispensation) who mediate the inbreathing of the psychic element and the spiritual seed,<sup>83</sup> and (2) the male angels who appear to be the heavenly consorts of the seed and minister to or "reap" it when it is

ripe.<sup>84</sup> Correspondingly we have in the Apocryphon the Autogenes or Christ and his lights, who represent the final destination of the redeemed, encouraging the Demiurge to inbreathe the divine power into man, in the guise of his own angels. The evident ambiguity of these groups of angels in the Valentinian accounts and the rather secondary nature of the proof text (Gal.3:19 on the subject of the law, not of creation!) might suggest that the germ, or at least one source of these Valentinian speculations, may lie in the Apocryphon's picture, which they have adjusted to cohere with the scriptural text and their own characteristic theology of the image (the Gnostic) and his angel.

This episode thus sets the scene for the struggle over man and his salvation between the heavenly world and Ialdabaoth and his powers. In the power of the Mother man possesses the principle of life, biological and intellectual, which is the precondition for salvation, and which the Ophites of Irenaeus represent as <sup>Nous</sup> / and Enthymesis.<sup>85</sup> But this is only one factor in man's present condition, and so the account is by no means completed.<sup>86</sup> Alongside the Metropator there also appears the Autogenes/Christ/Son (with the four lights) as a kind of saviour-figure on Sophia's behalf, as Janssens has pointed out.<sup>87</sup> If we assume that the long recension with its undifferentiated mention of the five lights is more original, his independent significance would be greatly diminished.<sup>88</sup> But there is evidence to suggest that

he was originally mentioned with the four and that he always appears in conjunction with them.

The struggle over man between the powers of light and darkness:

(i) The first archontic reaction and the heavenly response

Having received the power of the Mother, Adam moves. The short recension has an awkward lacuna at this point (BG 52,1 = CG III 24,13) while CG II 19,32f. (CG IV 30,17 is fragmentary but appears to correspond to CG II) relates how his body became powerful (  $\epsilon\mu\epsilon\omicron\mu$  ) and shone. CG III 24,13 appears to read: " [he became] stronger (  $\epsilon\mu$  [  $\epsilon\omicron\mu$  ] ) than him "(i.e. the first archon?), but has no mention of man shining, and BG 52,1 does not seem to have room for either idea. But since the archons' aim had been that Adam made in the image of and with the name of heavenly Man might by his power become a light for them,<sup>89</sup> and since these two ideas, power and light, occur in the continuation (Adam's wisdom is stronger than that of the archons and first archon,<sup>90</sup> and he is seen to shine or to have entered the light<sup>91</sup>), they must be considered a necessary presupposition which the redactor of BG may have omitted, but which those of the other texts felt was vital to the sense.

Since the first archon was responsible for this animation of Adam, the rest of the archons are inevitably jealous. The short recension gives a more detailed description of their contribution to the creation of psychic man,<sup>92</sup> while the long is content simply to

mention that he originated from them all and had power from them.<sup>93</sup>

Because of his freedom from evil, his superior mental capacity and power of light,<sup>94</sup> they bring him down to the region below the whole

of matter,<sup>95</sup> which, as Giversen suggests, may be best seen as a

preparation for his being clothed in matter.<sup>96</sup> There then follows

the passage discussed above in which the merciful beneficent Mother-

Father takes pity on the power of the Mother which the archons had

removed from the first archon to gain control over the body of Adam

(CG II 20,14 adds the reminder, "the psychic and perceptible

( αἰσθητόν ) body", to play down the extent of the archons' influence).

She/he sends out the good merciful Spirit, the Epinoia of light, as a

helper ( βοηθός cf. Gen. 2:18) for Adam, the first to descend.<sup>97</sup>

Here we have the first appearance of the principal redeemer figure

of the main body of the Apocryphon, in the closest association with

the Mother-Father, the Pronoia, on the one hand, and explicitly

identified with Eve, the helper and consort of Adam of the Genesis

account, on the other. It is also clear from what follows that not

only is she responsible for the primal revelation to Adam, but she

also represents the principle of continuous revelation. We shall have

to consider the relationship of this figure to the Pronoia of the revelation

discourse at the end of the long recension. in due course, and ask

whether they may not be one and the same, suggesting that the

revelation discourse is an integral part of the work, but at the moment



we shall concern ourselves with the description of the Epinoia.<sup>98</sup>

She is said to work at the whole creation, which would appear from the context to signify Adam, since <sup>our</sup> texts continue that she takes trouble with him, restoring him to his perfection (πλήρωμα<sup>99</sup>), enlightening him about the descent of the deficiency and showing him his way upwards.<sup>100</sup> Epinoia's revelatory activity is clearly to be understood as redemptive: the holy Spirit labours on the creature in preparation for its perfection and final ascent. This would appear to suggest a universal eschatological perspective: mankind will not be completely saved till the end, and the presence of the holy Spirit imparts revelation but not complete redemption. The Apocryphon gives the idea of the Spirit's presence a special interpretation: the Epinoia is concealed in Adam to escape the notice of the archons, but above all to correct the deficiency of the Mother.<sup>101</sup> The terminology of this section (restoration, πλήρωμα, ὑστερήματα) is strikingly parallel to that of Valentinianism but whether the latter is the borrower or the source, or whether both are employing common Gnostic material, is not entirely clear.

(ii) The second archontic reaction: the material body and the trees of Paradise

Because of the shadow of light (i.e. the Epinoia<sup>102</sup>) which is in him, Adam shone and his thinking elevated him above his

creators.<sup>103</sup> They stared up<sup>104</sup> and saw how elevated he was and the whole band of archons, angels and powers decided on a counter-plan. This involves the union of the elements of fire, earth, water and the four fiery winds in a great confusion which brings man into the shadow of death.<sup>105</sup> This is the cue for a further creation from the material elements of earth, water, fire and wind (πνεῦμα), which the Apocryphon characteristically interprets as matter (ύλη), darkness, desire (ἐπιθυμία) and the counterfeit (ἀντίμιμον; CG III), opposed (ἀντικείμενον; BG) or variegated (εὐχρίστα; CG II) spirit.<sup>106</sup>

In typical Gnostic fashion this material body of ours is depicted as composed out of evil hypostatized passions and hostile elements, described as "the fetter", "the tomb" (σπῆλαιον) of the created form of the body imposed on us by the robbers (i.e. the archons), and summed up as "the fetter of oblivion".<sup>107</sup> Thus man became mortal and he is described as the first to descend and the first separation or distinction.<sup>108</sup>

But, as usual, lest we should feel too pessimistic about man's situation, his imprisonment in the mortal body, his enslavement to the passions, his ignorance and deficiency, we are reminded of the continuous revelatory (and hence redemptive) activity of the heavenly light-figure. However there appears to be some confusion in the versions at this point. While the long recension insists that the

redeemer is the Epinoia of light who will be in Adam and will awaken his thinking,<sup>109</sup> the short recension speaks of the Ennoia of the preexistent (CG III) or first (? BG) light as present in him wakening his thought.<sup>110</sup> Such a figure could be identified as Barbelo,<sup>111</sup> giving further support to the thesis that the various redeemer-figures, the Mother-Father, the holy Spirit, the Epinoia of light, are fundamentally identical. The long recension may represent an attempt to remove such a risky conception, and, by its use of the future tenses, to tidy up further inconsistencies in that the Epinoia is not named "Zoe" by Adam until he is wakened by her later in the Paradise account. Thus Janssens may be right to see these two episodes involving the Epinoia as anticipatory,<sup>112</sup> inserted to reassure us of the reality of the divine redeeming power in Adam's (and our) plight.

Then follows the episode of the two trees of Paradise, reinterpreted in terms of the hostility, deceitfulness and evil character of our mortal existence, represented by the counterfeit spirit (the tree of life), and the presence of the redeeming power of the Epinoia of light or holy Spirit (the tree of the knowledge of good and evil).<sup>113</sup> While the short recension remains more faithful to the Genesis account in having the first archon set Adam in the garden (ΠΠδρδΔιζοζ) of which he said it would be a delight (τρυφῆς ; cf. Gen 2:15; 3:23f.LXX),<sup>114</sup> the long has the archons continue their battle with man by putting him in Paradise and commanding him to eat at leisure.<sup>115</sup> Since the long

recension appears to break the continuity of thought which revolves round the word "delight",<sup>116</sup> it would appear to be secondary, but its insistence on the archontic command, "Eat!" may explain why: it wishes to make crystal clear the true nature of the trees of Paradise. For the Paradise episode is plainly a further archontic trick, and thus the Gnostic reinterpretation of Genesis continues. The delight and beauty of the garden is bitter and lawless; it is a deceit. The trees are hostility and impiety, their fruit is a poison for which there is no cure and their promise is death.<sup>117</sup> For the archons' tree, the texts continue, is the tree of life, whose true nature the Saviour promises to reveal to a plural audience (i.e. John and other disciples?). His description corresponds quite closely to the previous one. The tree of life's root is bitter, its branches shadows of death, its leaves hate and deceit, its sap an ointment of wickedness, its fruit death and a desire is its seed, and it grows in the darkness. Those who taste it dwell in the underworld.<sup>118</sup> Conversely the tree of the knowledge of good and evil is the Epinoia of light, concerning which, the short recension continues, command was given not to taste, that is not to listen to it, since the command was directed against him (man) to prevent him looking up to his perfection and recognising his lack of it.<sup>119</sup>

The long recension seems to have difficulties with this passage. It plays down the presence and role of the counterfeit spirit, tends to

obscure the distinction between and depiction of the two trees, particularly the tree of knowledge which is introduced very cursorily, and omits the prohibition against eating, i.e. heeding it. The reason may be either that it has already had the archons command "Eat!" , or that it wishes to avoid too literal an acceptance of the motif: rather than eating of the tree of life, men already are involved in the life the tree represents. Hence CG II 21,24f. reads "the tree of their life". The archons are supposed to be unaware of the present or future existence of the Epinoia in man, therefore the prohibition is out of place.<sup>120</sup>

There then occurs a sudden interjection by the Saviour: "But it was I who raised them (sic!) up and made them eat." John is prompted to ask whether it was not the snake who passed on the instruction, and the Saviour replies with a smile that what the snake taught was the sowing ( σπέρμα ) of desire, defilement and destruction, i.e. sexual reproduction, which would be of use to him.<sup>121</sup> This passage shows clear signs of being an insertion. BG 57,20 and CG II 22,9 both refer to "them", i.e. Adam and Eve, although Eve has not yet been created. CG III 28,16f. has corrected this to "him" and like CG II 22,11 has John ask was it not the snake who instructed him (CG II Adam), BG 58,3 retaining the more biblical "her" (i.e. Eve). However the passage may have an explanatory and anticipatory role, stimulated by the mention of man recognising

his nakedness of perfection (cf. Gen. 3: 7).<sup>122</sup> If it was not the snake who instructed Adam and Eve to eat of the tree of knowledge, i.e. listen to the Epinoia, who was it? The Saviour asserts that it was he. However it later transpires that the Epinoia is not the tree but - at least according to the short recension - instructs Adam through the tree in the form of an eagle to eat the knowledge.<sup>123</sup> The long recension appears to be even more complicated in that it has man taste the knowledge through respectively the Pronoia, the Saviour himself and the Epinoia.<sup>124</sup> As we shall see when we come to deal with this passage, the long recension may represent an attempt to make sense of the Saviour's first interjection, that he raised up Adam to eat, and also to integrate the redeemer figure, the Pronoia of the closing revelation discourse, more thoroughly into the narrative.

What we have here are several not entirely consistent interpretations of the Genesis account of the trees in Paradise, the snake who instructs Adam and Eve, and the consequences of their eating. The trees and the eating are allegorised and the snake is demoted. The underlying theological paradox which the passage in Genesis is employed to illustrate is the presence of the possibility of salvation and the continuous revelation (represented by the power of the Mother and the Epinoia respectively) in the Gnostic's present situation, the fetter of oblivion, the tomb of the material body. Even the presence of the Epinoia itself is not enough, as we shall see; man needs the

divine Spirit itself, the Mother-Father or Pronoia, here identified with Christ, to descend and grant decisive redemption. Thus Janssens is probably right to insist on the distinction between the Saviour who raises up Adam and Eve<sup>125</sup> and the Epinoia who instructs or shows them,<sup>126</sup> although, as she goes on to admit, it is not always easy to determine whether it is the Pronoia (i.e. the Saviour) or the Epinoia who is at work. But this is partly because, as she argues, the Pronoia frequently acts through the Epinoia who is fundamentally an emanation of the former.<sup>127</sup>

These episodes of the creation of the material body as a second stage (which is not in Genesis but is special to the Apocryphon<sup>128</sup>) and the two trees in Paradise (which is in Genesis but which is also interpreted in a way unique to the Apocryphon: the tree of life means ignorance and death, the forbidden tree of knowledge means saving gnosis<sup>129</sup>) are developed to explain the nature of certain aspects of the Gnostic's existence; his material body and the influences it is prey to; desire and the passions, mortality, sexual generation, ignorance of man's spiritual nature and origin (deficiency). Man is a battleground of two opposing spirits; the good spirit or Epinoia and an evil spirit, imitating the good, which prevents man from reaching knowledge of his situation.<sup>130</sup>

(iii) The third archontic reaction: the creation of Eve

Man's situation, however, has not been fully delineated: the



division into sexes has not yet occurred. This is provoked by the sudden introduction of the first archon, simply described as "he" in the short recension, but clumsily identified in the long.<sup>131</sup> His motivation is the fact that he recognised that she (Eve; BG 58,8) or he (Adam; CG III 28,24; CG II 22,15f.) would not be (BG 58,8) or had not been (CG III 28,24; CG II 22,15f.) obedient to him. The subject cannot still be the snake, since Eve obeyed him, but must be the first archon, as the long recension recognises. This is perhaps further evidence that the Saviour's interjection is a later insertion. The redactor of BG has probably been led by his recollection of Genesis to change the original "he" to "she" and the past tense to a future since Eve did not yet exist. The disobedience would appear to involve eating from the tree of knowledge, i.e. heeding the Epinoia, as the long recension interprets this.<sup>132</sup> But both long and short recensions date the Epinoia's concealment in Adam only after the first archon casts an oblivion over him.<sup>133</sup>

The purpose of the first archon is to bring out the power of the Mother given to Adam by him.<sup>134</sup> Now the short recension repeats this in very similar wording after describing the concealment of the Epinoia in Adam and Ialdabaoth's decision to bring her out of Adam's rib,<sup>135</sup> while the long has an entirely different version which involves Ialdabaoth taking part of his power from Adam, creating a female form like the Epinoia and inserting the power in it.<sup>136</sup>

Clearly this is an attempt to combine two different traditions. The first has Ialdabaoth attempt to empty Adam of the power of the Mother by creating Eve as a kind of lure - which is precisely the picture presented by the Ophites of Irenaeus.<sup>137</sup> The second is a version of the archontic attempt to defile and ravish the spiritual woman as found in e.g. the Hypostasis of the Archons and the Untitled Treatise from Codex II.<sup>138</sup> In this version Ialdabaoth creates Eve in imitation of the Epinoia (who was supposed to have concealed herself in Adam unobserved!), in order, presumably, to lure her out and seize her. Thus what the short recension has left unassimilated the long has patently tried to combine.

If, as this suggests, we are dealing with two traditions, one involving the power of the Mother, the other the activity of the Epinoia, this might explain the abrupt appearance of the first archon in this episode. The previous episodes involving the Epinoia (being sent as helper, awakening Adam's thought and being present in Paradise as the tree of knowledge) have broken the original continuity of the other tradition which related how Ialdabaoth inbreathed the power of the Mother into Adam who then shone and was exalted above his creators, and how Ialdabaoth, full of jealousy, wanted to recover the power. This continuity is preserved by the Ophites of Irenaeus.<sup>139</sup> The different tendencies of the two traditions and the similarity of the first to Ophite ideas are further strengthened by a comparison of the

terminology involved. The passages concerning the Epinoia (BG 53,4-54,4; 55,15-18; 57,8-19 and parr.) use terms like correction (  $\tau\alpha\lambda\omega\epsilon\rho\alpha\tau\epsilon$  ); perfection (  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\mu\alpha$  ;  $\delta\omega\kappa$  ); instruction (  $\tau\epsilon\upsilon\nu\sigma\upsilon\epsilon\iota\delta\alpha\tau\epsilon$  ); deficiency (  $\psi\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\eta\mu\alpha$  ;  $\psi\tau\alpha$  ); awakening (  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\nu\omicron\upsilon\epsilon$  ) and formlessness (  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\chi\eta\mu\omicron\sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\eta$  ), which are strongly reminiscent of the technical terminology of Valentinianism, while the passages which seem to refer to the power (BG 51,8-52,15; 54,5-9; 58,8-12 and parr.) speak more simply of man's thought (  $\mu\epsilon\epsilon\upsilon\epsilon$  , i.e.  $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$  or  $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\theta\acute{\upsilon}\mu\eta\varsigma$  ? ) being stronger, more powerful or more exalted (  $\tau\alpha\lambda\pi\omicron$  ;  $\epsilon\mu\epsilon\omicron\mu$  ;  $\lambda\iota\epsilon$  ) than that of his creators.<sup>140</sup>

The fact that two or more traditions are here being conflated is further indicated by the triple repetition, in remarkably similar terms,<sup>141</sup> of the first archon's decision to remove the power. The second occasion, moreover, involves his decision to remove the supposedly invisible Epinoia from Adam's side or rib, a task which proves impossible.<sup>142</sup> With the third instance we appear to have reverted to the original situation; the attempt to remove the power. This involves the first archon creating a female figure, but not from Adam's rib - a further Gnostic "correction" of "Moses".<sup>143</sup> The idea of the rib thus occurs side by side in two different versions. The long recension, in its attempt to smooth out inconsistencies only involves itself in more. Having related the original intention of the

first archon to remove the power, it then tells of the unsuccessful attempt on the Epinoia and concludes with Ialdabaoth taking part of the power from Adam, forming a female being in the image of the Epinoia and putting the power he had taken into it.<sup>144</sup> The object of this manoeuvre is apparently no longer to remove the power, which is easily done, but to trap the heavenly Epinoia in the earthly Eve. In the short recension, however, as in the Ophite system, the creation of earthly Eve is to be the means of removing the power from Adam.

But if this was the original formulation with which the Epinoia tradition has been uneasily combined, what was the significance of the oblivion cast over Adam,<sup>145</sup> and what are we to make of the fact that in the short recension Adam becomes sober from the darkness before the Epinoia removes the veil?<sup>146</sup> It is instructive to compare the accounts of these events in the Hypostasis of the Archons<sup>147</sup> and the Untitled Treatise from Codex II.<sup>148</sup> In the former the archons decide to bring an oblivion over Adam so that he falls asleep. This oblivion is then interpreted, in a fashion similar to that of the Apocryphon, as the ignorance. They thereupon open his side like a living woman and build up his side with flesh in her place. Adam thus becomes totally psychic but the spiritual woman thus formed awakens him so that when he sees her he exclaims: "You will be called 'the

Mother of the living ( TMDAY MNETONZ )' ".<sup>149</sup> Then follows the motif of the archontic seduction, not of the spiritual woman but of her shadow.<sup>150</sup>

The Untitled Treatise presents a rather different picture of events. According to it Zoe/Eve, the daughter of Sophia, is sent to waken the soulless Adam. When he sees her he says, as in the Hypostasis, "You will be called 'the Mother of the living' because you gave me life". When the authorities hear of this they decide to seduce her to prevent her ascent. They plan to deceive Adam into thinking that she is from his rib and thus subservient by bringing an oblivion over him and instructing him in his sleep.<sup>151</sup> Then follows, as in the Hypostasis, the archontic attempt to seduce Eve, which fails. What they do defile is her likeness left secretly beside Adam.<sup>152</sup> As we have already observed, the same two motifs (the appearance of Eve and her seduction by the archons) also appear side by side in the Ophite system.

Points worth noting in the Hypostasis and Untitled Treatise are ; the interpretation of Eve as originally the spiritual woman, the heavenly revealer/redeemer who is distinct from her earthly counterpart and who alone deserves the title "Mother of the living"; the alternative interpretations of Adam's rib (in the Hypostasis Eve is actually taken from Adam's side or rib, in the Untitled Treatise she is not and the idea is merely an archontic pretence) and the mention of Adam

being awakened and seeing Eve, which sparks off his naming of her. The oblivion motif loses its point unless it is interpreted in the manner of the Hypostasis or the Untitled Treatise - and this does suggest that originally the Apocryphon was aware of the version found in the Hypostasis. God (or the archons) cast an oblivion on Adam, removed, not his rib, but the light-power, and formed it into Eve who is thus indeed recognised by Adam as consubstantial with him.<sup>153</sup> When he sees her,<sup>154</sup> he immediately becomes sober from his oblivion (i.e. she is the revealer/redeemer rather than the Epinoia which the short version has hastily inserted in an attempt to harmonise) and calls her (the spiritual woman) "the Mother of all living".

The reinterpretation of the oblivion<sup>155</sup> as obscuring of the senses (  $\alpha\lambda\epsilon\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha\ \eta\ \sigma\iota\gamma\eta$  ) rather than as "Moses" said "he made him sleep",<sup>156</sup> suitably buttressed by the proof text from Isaiah,<sup>157</sup> appears to be a deliberate attempt to eschew the more literal interpretation of the Hypostasis, as is the reinterpretation of Adam's rib or side. In the case of the Epinoia, Ialdabaoth fails to bring her out of Adam's rib,<sup>158</sup> and earthly Eve is created independently by him with no reference to an actual rib.<sup>159</sup> Paradoxically, the long recension's attempt to harmonise the various traditions by having Ialdabaoth remove some of the power from Adam and insert it in the female figure may preserve what was a more original version. As the contrast between the more literal version of the Hypostasis

and its sophisticated reinterpretation in the Untitled Treatise suggests, the Apocryphon's redactors may have been worried by the implications of the former that Adam was entirely emptied of light power by the creation of Eve. Furthermore, the Apocryphon has its own revealer/redeemer, the Epinoia, who must be fitted into the framework supplied by Genesis. Thus we find that she assumes the characteristics of the spiritual woman whom the archons try to seduce in the following episode in the Hypostasis, the Untitled Treatise and the Ophite system. Ialdabaoth's attempt to bring out the light-power becomes his unsuccessful attempt to lure out the Epinoia, and it is she, rather than the light-power present as the spiritual Eve, who removes the veil from Adam's senses and is thus named by him "Zoe, the Mother of the living", an identification the Apocryphon has already established.

Janssens has made some attempt to show the propriety of the title in the case of earthly Eve,<sup>160</sup> suggesting that Adam and Eve's union is to be related to that of the consort, First Man, in whose image Adam was made, and Sophia, present in Eve as the helper. But it is not at all clear that the Epinoia is present in Eve at this juncture,<sup>161</sup> and that she is to be identified tout court with Sophia. The evidence of the Hypostasis and Untitled Treatise concerning Adam's naming his spiritual consort and that of the Apocryphon, pointing to the existence of a similar tradition adapted to harmonise with the latter's Epinoia tradition, indicates that the explanation we



have offered best fits the confused evidence of the versions. Once the original reference of the citations of Genesis 2: 23-24 to Adam's abandonment of his creators and union with his spiritual counterpart had been lost through the substitution of the Epinoia, the texts required a new interpretation. The reference to the man was taken to apply to the Epinoia, that to the woman to Sophia, and man's leaving his parents to the future descent of the Epinoia to unite with Sophia and his correction of her faults. As we have seen, the short recension appears to be aware of this interpretation, if in a confused fashion, while the long recension has taken the feminine figure named by Adam as Sophia and not the Epinoia.<sup>162</sup> Thus it was led to understand her as the consort who would be sent out to Adam and to renew the reference to him as leaving his father and mother. This further repetition of Genesis 2:24 appears to have caused the harassed copyist of CG II 23, 17ff. to repeat a whole sentence.

This complex episode allows the author(s) of the Apocryphon to explain how the division of Adam into male and female came about.<sup>163</sup> Here we have a further element in man's present situation, the existence of woman, which implies the further fettering of the divine through reproduction and also explains (by appeal to the prevailing Jewish legends about the seduction of Eve) the existence of angelic intermediaries with control over the visible world. Characteristically, alongside the tradition of Ialdabaoth attempting to remove the light-

power from Adam and creating a woman as bait and receptacle for it, we have the presence of the Epinoia, just as in the Ophite system we have both the dew of light and the redemptive activity of Sophia. Even if Ialdabaoth is successful as regards the presence of the light-power (which as we shall see is later interpreted as the soul or pre-condition for salvation) in Eve, there is still the revelatory and redemptive activity of the Epinoia. If previous mention of her has been best seen as anticipatory, now she is present in her first redemptive role, removing the veils cast by Ialdabaoth on Adam's senses. If the long recension's attempt to reconcile the two traditions of the power and the Epinoia is to be judged secondary, yet it has developed a suggestive concept that, as Adam was created in the image of heavenly Man (i.e. Barbelo, the male virginal Spirit, the Pronoia) to gain something of his light and power, so Eve was created in the image of the Mother of all living, the holy Spirit, the Epinoia, the offspring of Pronoia/Barbelo, in order, presumably, to gain control of her.

The tensions and contradictions visible in both recensions are to some extent the result of the combination of different traditions, but they also serve to express the classic Gnostic paradox and dilemma: how to proclaim their certainty that they were indeed the elect, possessing the divine power within themselves, yet do justice to the elements in their own existence which threatened that assurance; the weight

of matter and the senses; the fact of sexual differentiation; the lure of the passions and the dead weight of mortality and fate.

The eating of knowledge and the expulsion from Paradise

Despite frequent anticipations, Adam and Eve have not yet eaten of the tree of knowledge which has already been interpreted (with some hesitation on the part of the long recension) as the Epinoia. Further they are still in Paradise and not in this present world of ignorance, darkness and death, governed by the demands of nature and the inexorable force of sexual reproduction, subject to the imperfect antitheses of justice and injustice and the conventions of morality. To account for this the Apocryphon makes further use of the tree of knowledge motif, but in this case as it occurs in Genesis 3 rather than Genesis 2.

The heavenly initiative in getting Adam and Eve to eat is again stressed. The snake had taught sexual reproduction merely;<sup>164</sup> it was the Saviour himself who encouraged Adam and Eve to eat.<sup>165</sup> But now we hear that it was through the authority (  $\alpha\upsilon\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  ,  $\mu\eta\tau\alpha\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  ) of the height and the revelation that this took place.<sup>166</sup> CG II 23,24-6 reads "through the  $\pi\rho\omicron\nu\omicron\iota\varsigma$  of the heavenly  $\alpha\upsilon\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  and through her (the Pronoia?) they tasted the perfect knowledge", while the very fragmentary parallel in CG IV appears to vary very significantly, inserting a phrase after the mention of the  $\alpha\upsilon\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  which in

Krause's reconstruction<sup>167</sup> speaks of the revelation and of her (the Epinoia?) giving Adam<sup>168</sup> knowledge. This appears to echo BG 60,18f. where the subject is indeed the Epinoia and the object Adam. The version in CG II may have omitted this accidentally (as a result of homoeoteleuton again?<sup>169</sup>) or on purpose, to remove the awkward reference to the Epinoia and reconcile this with the Saviour's previous assertion that he was responsible.

Whereas the short recension has the Epinoia instruct Adam in the knowledge through the tree in the form of an eagle,<sup>170</sup> the long has Adam and Eve taste the perfect knowledge through the Pronoia. Thereupon it abruptly breaks into the first person so that the Saviour insists: "It was I who appeared in the form of an eagle on the tree of knowledge, which is the Epinoia from the Pronoia of pure light, that I might teach them and awaken them from the deep sleep."<sup>171</sup> The emphatic form of the Saviour's statement is worthy of note. It is an attempt to confirm that it was indeed he, identified as the Pronoia, who got Adam and Eve to eat. Thus this passage, by identifying the Pronoia with the Saviour and describing his redeeming activity as teaching and awakening from sleep, accommodates the earlier interjection of the Saviour and the triple descent scheme of the Pronoia in the closing revelation discourse.<sup>172</sup>

The long recension is thus led to "correct" the short's representation of Epinoia in the form of an eagle on the tree (instead of herself

being the tree as in the earlier passage based on Genesis 2) instructing Adam<sup>173</sup> to eat the knowledge and thereby recognise his perfection. The two recensions then reunite briefly to underline the fault of both, but while the short describes it as ignorance the long comments that they recognised their own nakedness.<sup>174</sup> At this point the long recension, having virtually excluded the Epinoia, makes amends by reintroducing her. She revealed herself to both, being light, and awoke their thought.<sup>175</sup> There is no hint of this in the short recension although it does correspond to descriptions of her activity elsewhere.<sup>176</sup> Her presence here is probably due both to the awareness of the redactors of the long recension that the Epinoia was originally the subject in this episode, and to the need to counter the pessimistic note (fault, nakedness) with the promise of the continuous presence of the revealer/redeemer. Such an assurance is doubly necessary in the light of the reaction of the first archon, his expulsion of Adam and Eve from Paradise.

G.W. MacRae has attempted to show that the revelation discourse at the end of the long recension is not in fact extraneous, and that traces of the three descents of the Saviour/Pronoia can be found in both recensions.<sup>177</sup> He finds evidence of the first (unsuccessful) mission of the Saviour in the passage under discussion, the awakening of Adam and Eve in Paradise through the Epinoia and the Saviour.<sup>178</sup> However he is largely reliant on the evidence of the long recension

since it is precisely in it that the Saviour is described as awakening them (CG II 23,26-31), and the Epinoia as being responsible for man becoming sober (CG II 23,5ff.) and awakening his thought (CG II 26,33f.). He argues that in the short recension it is the Epinoia who does this but that even in it there are traces of the Saviour's activity (i.e. BG 57,8 - 58,1).<sup>179</sup> However there is no mention in the short recension at this point of the Epinoia awakening man; she merely instructs him,<sup>180</sup> and furthermore we have noted the secondary characteristics of the Saviour's interjection.

Then follows the inevitable archontic reaction. In accordance with its exegesis of Genesis 3:7, the Apocryphon has described how Adam and Eve came to eat or taste of the knowledge and thus become aware of their perfection (  $\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\nu\mu\alpha$  ) and fallen state of ignorance.<sup>181</sup> Following Genesis 3:8 (Adam's concealment from God) it relates how Ialdabaoth becomes aware that Adam and Eve have departed from him.<sup>182</sup> The same two motifs occur together in the Ophite system described by Irenaeus;<sup>183</sup> Adam and Eve after eating the tree of knowledge recognised the power which is above everything and departed (abscessisse) from their creators. The only difference between the two is that the Ophites, like the Hypostasis and Untitled Treatise from Codex II, give a major revelatory role to the snake and take the tree of knowledge motif literally rather than allegorically as does the Apocryphon (and the Baruch of Justin). The Apocryphon

continues with Ialdabaoth's curse. That the long recension has him curse the earth <sup>184</sup> rather than Adam and Eve as in the short, <sup>185</sup> although it is closer to the wording of Genesis 3:17, is probably better understood as a further example of its spiritualising tendency. As Sophia in Irenaeus' account of the Ophites <sup>186</sup> removes the dew of light from Adam and Eve lest the spirit from the height (principalitas, i.e.  $\alpha\upsilon\theta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  <sup>187</sup>) share in the curse (maledictionem), so the redactor of the long recension has Ialdabaoth curse Adam's earth rather than him and Eve, as originally. <sup>188</sup>

The long recension then diverges considerably from the short in that it has Ialdabaoth find Eve preparing herself for her husband, adding "he was lord over her although (or since) he was ignorant of the mystery which had taken place through the holy counsel". <sup>189</sup> The subject would appear to be Ialdabaoth rather than Adam as in Genesis 3:16 and the short recension, <sup>190</sup> and the ambiguity of the long recension suggests that it is secondary here, amending the text because it has failed to understand the allusion to the Genesis passage. The short recension divides at this point: BG 61, 10-12 reading: "but adding (  $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\tau\omicron\iota\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu$  ) of the woman that he would be lord over her", CG III 30, 24f. preferring: "He added of the woman that 'Your husband will be lord over you'". Both long and short are then in agreement about Ialdabaoth's ignorance of the mystery of the holy counsel. <sup>191</sup> The short recension is clearly preferable since



it makes sense of the Genesis reference, CG III perhaps being influenced by the use of direct speech in it. The long recension cannot be reconciled to the short in terms of a misunderstanding of the loan word  $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\ \pi\omicron\iota\epsilon\iota\upsilon$  or of the obscure term  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\sigma\tau\rho\omicron\phi\eta$  of the LXX. The most likely explanation seems to be that offered above: the redactors failed to spot the Genesis allusion and amended the text in the light of Ialdabaoth's subsequent seduction of Eve,<sup>192</sup> supplying a suitable verb to link the woman and her husband.<sup>193</sup>

What is the "mystery of the holy counsel" of which Ialdabaoth is ignorant when he ordains that the male should be lord over the female? Giversen is surely right to explain it in terms of the resolution or plan of the Metropator whereby, through the mediation of the five lights, the power of the Mother was inserted into Adam by Ialdabaoth.<sup>194</sup> Janssens would see the mystery as that of Gnostic marriage, the "great mystery" of the Gospel of Philip; Ialdabaoth did not know of the secret power hidden in Eve to allow Sophia to correct her deficiency in union with her consort.<sup>195</sup> But we should also recall the use of the terms "mystery" (  $\mu\upsilon\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\omicron\upsilon$  ) and "counsel" or "plan" (  $\omega\omicron\lambda\omicron\gamma\epsilon$  ) in the previous passage about the trees of Paradise. The Saviour there reveals the secret of the archons' life, that is the counsel they held with each other, i.e. the counterfeit spirit.<sup>196</sup> Over against the secret of the archons' plan, the counterfeit spirit which leads to death and ignorance, there is the secret of the heavenly

plan, the power of light hidden in Adam and Eve, and the presence of the holy Spirit, the Epinoia, who continually wakens man from his oblivion, drunkenness and ignorance so that he recognises his own substance and consort, Eve.

In an ironic reversal of Genesis the Apocryphon has Adam and Eve frightened to reprove their creator<sup>197</sup> and thus reveal his ignorance to his angels.<sup>198</sup> Finally he casts them out of the garden (Genesis 3:23) and cloaks them in thick darkness.<sup>199</sup> Thus we have the depiction through the reinterpretation of selected motifs from Genesis 3 (eating the tree of knowledge; "nakedness"; the curse; man as lord of the woman; the expulsion from Paradise) of further characteristics of man's present situation. Man does not live in Paradise; he is aware of his lack of perfect knowledge and of the tragic splitting of his original unity, of that mystery of the power found in men and women which seeks reunion, perfection, fulfilment. Man lives in a world which is under the curse. It is the creation of an ignorant Demiurge and a dominant characteristic of it is that the male is lord of the female despite their hidden equality and unity. But the Gnostic is conscious through the presence of the divine power in him and the work of the divine Spirit on him, of the mystery of the heavenly plan of restoration and removal of the deficiency which mars the divine element in the world, sinking it in oblivion.

The seduction of Eve and the origin of human generation

Besides the reality of the sexual distinction there is a further determinant of human existence, the biological urge to reproduce. Sex and generation are presented as a further device of the creator god and his satellites to keep men enslaved and blind to their true origin and destiny. To explain this the authors of the Apocryphon have recourse to the motif of the seduction of Eve by the archons. This appears in various guises in the Gnostic texts. In the Ophite system described by Irenaeus, for example, the rest of Ialdabaoth's offspring, attracted by and marvelling at the beauty of the woman created by their progenitor, call her Eve, lust after her and beget sons, i.e. the angels, by her. Eve's adultery (and claim to be the Mother of all living?) is then attacked by Sophia's further heavenly rebuke.<sup>200</sup> This is followed by a second use of the motif, in association with and in partial explanation of the expulsion of Adam and Eve from Paradise. Ialdabaoth himself tried to ravish Eve and beget sons by her, but was unable to because of Sophia's secret opposition and evacuation of the dew of light from her.<sup>201</sup> A characteristic of the theology of the Ophites is that in both cases the dew of light was removed beforehand.

Elements of both of these interpretations of the motif occur in the Hypostasis and the Untitled Treatise. In both the archons discover that the spiritual woman has awakened their Adam, are thrown into

great agitation and attempt to seduce her, only to be foiled by her in that what they defile is her earthly image, which she leaves behind.<sup>202</sup> The Ophite distinction between the earthly Eve who is defiled and the dew of light which remains intact appears in these texts as the distinction between the defiled image and the unscathed original heavenly Eve. The Hypostasis, perhaps closer to the original form of the motif, has the archons motivated by their infatuation.<sup>203</sup> The Untitled Treatise interprets their action as an attempt to defile her so that she cannot return to her heavenly light, thereby ensuring the subordination of her and her offspring to themselves and to Adam.<sup>204</sup> This latter interpretation also occurs in the apocalypses used by the Audians, the "Book of the Demands" and the "Apocalypse of the Alien" quoted by Theodore bar Konai; the aeons plan to seduce Eve to gain power over her offspring.<sup>205</sup> In the Untitled Treatise the earthly Eve is seduced and conceives Abel first from the chief archon, then the rest of the sons from the seven authorities and their angels.<sup>206</sup>

The background to this motif may be Genesis 6:1-2 as Bullard<sup>207</sup> and Janssens<sup>208</sup> suggest, but we should carefully distinguish here, as Jonas points out,<sup>209</sup> between the - related, but not identical - motifs of the fornication of the angels (of Genesis 6) and the seduction of the archons. The idea, found in rabbinic and Gnostic sources, that the Devil (in the guise of the snake) begot Cain (and Abel) by Eve<sup>210</sup> has clearly played some part, along with speculation, Jewish

and otherwise, on Genesis 6, in the development of both. But whatever the precise source or sources, the seduction motif is used by the Apocryphon to explain the origin of sexual reproduction and the nature of the archontic beings who rule over man, and who embody the kind of imperfect morality (righteous/unrighteous) which pertains in this world. Ialdabaoth is once more the protagonist as in the creation of Eve and the expulsion from Paradise. According to the short recension, he saw the virgin (παρθενα) standing beside Adam and became filled with ignorance since he wanted to raise up offspring (σπέρμα) from her.<sup>211</sup> The long recension, in that it adds as motivation the fact that the first archon had seen the Epinoia appear from her,<sup>212</sup> would appear to be secondary, representing a tendency to emphasise the soteriological role of the Epinoia.<sup>213</sup> Having mentioned the Epinoia, however, the long recension hastily has the Pronoia of the All dispatch assistants to remove Zoe (i.e. the Epinoia) from Eve lest she be defiled by Ialdabaoth's assault.<sup>214</sup> This is a precise counterpart to the tendency noted above in the Ophite system, the Hypostasis and the Untitled Treatise: to ensure that the divine redeeming element or figure remains undefiled by distinguishing and at times removing it from its earthly vessel. In the Ophite system the parallel to the long recension is more marked: Sophia, the redeemer, secretly empties Eve of the dew of light lest the spirit from the height (principalitas = αὐτοκρατορία) should share either in

cursing or in (sexual) abuse (opprobrium) at the hands of Ialdabaoth.<sup>215</sup>

After this digression by the long recension, all four versions agree in depicting Ialdabaoth as ravishing Eve and begetting two sons.<sup>216</sup>

But the two recensions reverse their names. Whereas the long first gives their names as Eloim (ΕΛΩΙΜ i.e. Elohim) and Jave (ΙΑΥΕ i.e. Yahweh), further identifying them by assigning a bear face (ΒΟ) to Eloim and a cat face (ΚΟ) to Jave,<sup>217</sup> the short omits the primary identification and ascribes the bear face to Jave and the cat face to

Eloim.<sup>218</sup> Both recensions agree that the one is righteous (ΔΙΚΑΙΟΣ)

the other unrighteous (ΑΔΙΚΟΣ) but continue with their reversed identifications; Jave as righteous and Eloim as unrighteous in the long, vice versa in the short.<sup>219</sup> The short then has the righteous

set over the fire and the spirit, the unrighteous over the water and the earth,<sup>220</sup> while the long has Jave over fire and wind (ΤΗΥ)

and Eloim over water and earth.<sup>221</sup> And finally, whereas the short

recension has them called Cain and Abel by all the generations of

men on earth up till the present day,<sup>222</sup> the long makes Ialdabaoth

responsible for naming them in view of his wickedness (ΠΕΥΟΥΡΓΙΑ),

and appears to attach the reference to the present day to the following

sentence.<sup>223</sup> A few lines later we are told that Ialdabaoth set the

two over authorities (ΥΡΧΗ) so that they should rule over the

tomb (ΣΤΗΛΑΙΟΥ ; ΜΕΛΟΥ), namely the material body.<sup>224</sup>

Despite the reversals in identification the basic structure of this passage is clear. The powers which rule over the elements, and thus over man's material body, are derived from the union of Ialdabaoth and Eve. The more elevated elements (fire and wind or spirit) are governed by the righteous archon whom men have identified as Abel, the less elevated (water and earth) by the unrighteous whom men have identified as Cain. These two are not (as in Genesis, the Ophite System, the Hypostasis etc.) the sons of Adam.<sup>225</sup> But the problem of their identification with Jave and Eloim remains. It is surely significant that only this identification is reversed. The descriptions of their appearance, their character, the elements they control and the names men have given them all remain constant. This suggests that their identification with Jave and Eloim may have been a later interpretation, and this hypothesis may find some support in the fact that the two have already appeared in different animal-like forms among the seven powers of Ialdabaoth, Eloaios with the countenance (20) of a donkey, Iao with that of a snake.<sup>226</sup> The two recensions have made different choices over which divine name to identify with Cain, the first son in Genesis 4 and here the unrighteous archon governing the lower elements. The long, perhaps aware that Elohim occurs in the Hebrew of Genesis 1:1 and Yahweh (alongside Elohim) for the first time in Genesis 2:4, has identified Elohim with the firstborn bear-faced archon Cain and Jave with Abel, switching



the two round when the text mentioned the righteous (Abel) before the unrighteous (Cain). The short recension has preferred to identify Jave with Cain and ended up with an exact reversal of the long.

It is difficult to judge which of these traditions is more original, but certainly the short recension appears more original in its treatment of the naming of Cain and Abel. The reading in CG II 24,24ff. that Ialdabaoth named the archons, with its ambiguous and awkward explanation ("in that he saw his (?)guile"), and the divergence of CG IV at this point suggest that the long recension is secondary. This is perhaps further evidence of a tendency in the long recension to stress the negative character of Ialdabaoth.<sup>227</sup>

It is in this context, sandwiched between the origin and activity of these archons who were the first product of sexual intercourse, that the Apocryphon relates how ordinary earthly intercourse began. The point being made, of course, is that it was Ialdabaoth and his powers who initiated and control sex and human reproduction, and who still ensure its continuation. That this had been previously attributed to the snake<sup>228</sup> might further confirm the secondary nature of the Saviour's previous interjection; the snake's activity has been modelled on that of Ialdabaoth here. However the snake could be seen as the agent of the first archon or even the first archon himself. Thus it was once more through the efforts of Ialdabaoth that sexual intercourse

began and continues in that he sowed a desire for reproduction ( ἐπιθυμία, σπορά ) in Adam.<sup>229</sup> The gist of the following passage, in which BG and CG III differ from one another as well as from the long recension, seems to be that by means of this desire and the operation of the counterfeit spirit in the human race they (men? the archons?) produced their image.<sup>230</sup> BG 63, 6-9 has the rather meaningless: "so that ( ὥστε ) it is out of this substance ( οὐσία ) which produces an image from their counterfeit ( ἀντίμιμον )", whereas CG III 32, 1-3 has the much more comprehensible: "so that ( ὥστε ) through it ( f ), namely this ( or the ) substance ( οὐσία ) they beget their image through it ( m ), namely their counterfeit spirit ( ἀντίμιμον πνεῦμα )". CG II 24, 29-32 (= CG IV 38, 16-20) is rather different, and reads: "Now ( δέ ) he produced ( ἀγαθογονοῦς - an echo of Gen 4:25 LXX ἐγένεσθησθε ; Coptic τοὔνεε ?<sup>231</sup>) through the intercourse ( συνουσία ) the begetting of the image of the bodies ( σῶμα ) and provided ( ? χωρηγέιν ) for them out of his varying spirit ( πνεῦμα εὐαγγελισαίνον )".

The key to this confusion may lie in the term οὐσία of the short recension. Krause himself suggests this in that he reads ( συν ) οὐσία at CG III 32, 1f., in agreement with CG II 24, 30. It would appear more likely that the long recension emended the ambiguous term οὐσία into the more comprehensible συνουσία, understood to mean "intercourse", than vice versa. The long recension must have

taken this in a literal sense as referring to the production of human bodies in the image of the archons. The original reference to the counterfeit spirit as an element in man through which the images were created was taken to signify the varying spirit Ialdabaoth later inserted into man. The short recension, on the other hand, apparently uses  $\sigma\upsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  and  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\sigma\upsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  to mean not Adam and Eve's intercourse but their identity of substance. Thus when the Epinoia removes the veil from Adam's eyes, BG 60,3f. reads: "Immediately when he recognised his  $\sigma\upsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  he said ....", the parallel in CG III 30,3f. preferring: "his  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\sigma\upsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  which resembles him". Again, Adam's begetting of Seth in the following passage (BG 63,12f.) is described in terms of his recognising (or knowing in the sexual sense?) his  $\sigma\upsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  which resembles him.<sup>232</sup> The ambiguity of  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\sigma\upsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  may also be suggested by the fact that the short recension qualifies it by adding "marital",<sup>233</sup> whereas the long recension appears to avoid the term  $\sigma\upsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  and is evidently unaware that  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\sigma\upsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  can have any other than a sexual connotation.

Behind the disarray in the short recension therefore may lie the idea that the desire for offspring sown in Adam and Eve should be understood as a kind of substance akin to the counterfeit spirit, from which ordinary earthly men are produced in the image of the archons, in antithesis to the heavenly substance in Adam and Eve, consubstantial with the Mother and her spirit, which produces the Gnostics in her

image.<sup>234</sup> Thus the short recension stresses that Seth is the product of Adam's union with his own substance,<sup>235</sup> and speaks of the Mother's spirit descending to raise up the substance which resembles him.<sup>236</sup> Again CG III's version seems preferable both to the confusion in BG<sup>237</sup> and the apparent tidying-up operation of the long recension (Ialdabaoth is made responsible rather than the ambiguous "they").

After the mention of the installation of the two archons over the tomb of the material body, which helps to explain the origin and nature of the moral order which governs the visible universe,<sup>238</sup> the Apocryphon relates the birth of Seth and once more the long recension presents a theological expansion of the more unadorned version in the short. Whereas BG 63, 12-14, continuing the Gnostic reinterpretation of Genesis, simply talks of Adam knowing his substance which resembles him and begetting Seth (cf. Genesis 4:25), and CG III 32, 6-8 prefers to speak of Adam knowing his own lawlessness ( *ἀνομία* <sup>239</sup> ), CG II 24, 35-25,2 and CG IV 38, 24-9 relate that when Adam knew the image of his own foreknowledge ( *πρόγνωσις* ) he begot the image of the Son of Man and called him "Seth" in accordance with the way of the generation ( *κατὰ τὴν* ) in the aeons. In the short recension this last phrase appears to belong to the following passage describing the sending of the Mother's spirit *as* (had already happened) in the case of the heavenly race ( *γενεῶν* ).<sup>240</sup> This is

best taken as a reference to the previous descent of the holy Spirit, the Mother's consort, to correct her. That this was also the original context in the long recension is obvious from the presence of *ὁμοίως* in CG II 25,2f. This makes no sense if taken with the following sentence; it must mark the conclusion of the previous sentence ("just as ( *ΝΘΕ ; ΚΥΤ'* )..... so ( *ΝΤΕΕΙΛΕ ; ὁμοίως* )").<sup>241</sup> The redactors of the long recension have mistranslated the *γενεά* of BG 63,15 and CG III 32,8 as *ἄπὸ* and taken it to refer to the fact that the earthly Seth is named after the heavenly. Thus the long recension has been induced to develop the parallel suggested, in the light of Genesis 4:25 (and 1:26f.): just as Adam was created in the image of and named after the heavenly Man (Adamās or Barbelo appearing as Adamas<sup>242</sup>), so Seth is produced by Adam in the image and with the name of the heavenly Son of Man who was coupled with Man in the rebuke from heaven.

#### The descent of the Mother's spirit and its saving activity

Having explained how sexual generation originated from the initiative of Ialdabaoth and how his two offspring by Eve control the four elements and thus man's body, the Apocryphon feels bound to relate how the world of light countered this further archontic move. But BG and CG III again disagree and both differ from the long recension about precisely what happens. While BG 63, 14-17 reads: "And as with the race which is in heaven among the aeons, so the

Mother sent the one who belongs to her", CG III 32,8-10 has:

"According to ( κατέ ) the heavenly race above in the aeons so ( ὁμοίως ) they sent the Mother her own ( ἴδιος ) spirit ( πνεῦμα )".

Who is the Mother? Janssens argues on the basis of the mention of the heavenly race that she must be the Pronoia and not Sophia,<sup>243</sup>

but the long recension (which she, of course is not concerned with)

clearly assumes that "the Mother" must refer to Sophia. Thus

CG II 25,2f. and CG IV 38, 29f. read "so ( ὁμοίως ) the other

Mother ( ΤΚΕΜΙΘΩΥ : i.e. Barbelo, the Pronoia) sent down her

spirit".<sup>244</sup> As I have argued above, the reference to the race

above in the aeons has already misled the redactors of the long recension,

and in it may lie the key to the confusion here. BG 63,18-64,3

continues; "The Spirit came down to (or for, κατέ<sup>245</sup>) her, to raise

up the substance which resembles him, after the pattern (τύπος) of

the perfection, to rouse them out of the oblivion (βύβη) and

wickedness (κακία) of the grave." The parallel in CG III 32,10-14

omits the mention of the descent and reads: "to raise up those who

resemble him (the Spirit) after the pattern ( [τύπος] ) of the

perfection (πλήρωμα) and he brings them out of the oblivion (λήθη)

and wickedness (κακία [α]) of the grave (or cave; [ε]πηλάσιον)."

Now the descent motif directly recalls the previous mission of

Sophia's consort to correct her deficiencies.<sup>246</sup> BG thus makes

explicit that as Sophia's consort, the Spirit, had descended to her

from the Pleroma with the consent of her brothers, the heavenly race, to correct her deficiencies, so she now dispatches her own spirit to its kindred substance the immovable race of the Gnostics, to rescue it.<sup>247</sup>

Arai has argued that the mention of the Spirit descending to her ( N 2 C ) contradicts the idea that the Mother sent it and that therefore CG III's version is preferable,<sup>248</sup> but against that we would contend; (1) the reference to the race in the aeons makes more sense if it is meant to signify an event on the earthly plane parallel to the dispatch to Sophia of her consort from the Pleroma. The appropriate parallel is not the sending to Adam of Sophia's consort to help him and her, since this has already happened, but the mission of her own spirit to her substance to awaken and correct it. (2) The evidence of the long recension, as we shall see, suggests that it emended the reference in its Vorlage to the Mother (i.e. Sophia) sending her spirit to apply to Barbelo, since the original contradicted the Apocryphon's general tendency to present Sophia as solely the helpless recipient of redemption. But Barbelo, of course, as indicated, had already sent out the Spirit, Sophia's consort. The redactors of CG III have gone further than those of the long recension and made the Mother the object of the mission. As Schottroff rightly argues, BG's version must be considered primary here since it best explains the origin of the other two versions. CG II (and CG IV) and



CG III have attempted to clear up the ambiguity of "the Mother" and eliminate any suggestion that the heavenly Mother, the real source of redemption, and the defective Sophia could be ultimately one and the same and that Sophia could act as redeemer.<sup>249</sup> (3) The NAC of BG 63,18 could either be a reminiscence of BG 47,4; an ethic dative as Giversen suggests,<sup>250</sup> or a proleptic reference to the substance which the Spirit descends to rouse. The redactors of CG III may have dropped an existing reference to the Spirit's descent to Sophia either because it had already been mentioned (CG III 21,6-11), or because they did not wish to draw attention to the fact that Sophia was still below the heavenly realm and apparently present and active in our world.<sup>251</sup>

Whereas the short recension represents the Spirit's work as awakening those akin to him from the oblivion and evil of earthly existence, the long supplies a rather different picture. According to it the other Mother (i.e. Barbelo) sent out her Spirit in (or as) the image (Εἰκ) of her (Sophia?) who is like her (Barbelo?) and as an antitype (ἀντίτυπος) of those who are in (the) Pleroma, in order that she (Barbelo?) should prepare a dwelling place for the aeons who will come down. He (i.e. the Spirit) made them drink a water of oblivion from (the) chief archon so that they would not recognise from where they came.<sup>252</sup> The Spirit is given a much less positive redemptive role here; preparing or acting as the

heavenly model of an earthly dwelling for those divine souls who would be sent down later,<sup>253</sup> and having them drink the water of Lethe via the first archon so that they would forget their origin.<sup>254</sup>

The first role of the spirit recalls the Untitled Text in the Bruce Codex in which those begotten of the Mother beg the Father to send them incorporeal spirits to dwell in them. He does so, sending powers of discernment who know the ordinance of the heavenly aeons and are arranged in accordance with them. They create the land of air as the dwelling place for those who had come forth. Above it is the true dwelling place within which are the airy antitypes (ἀντίτυποι).<sup>255</sup> The second role of the spirit, while recalling the Greek mythologumenon found in Plato, as Giversen notes,<sup>256</sup> is much closer to the picture presented in Book III of the Pistis Sophia where Christ is explaining how the archons compel man to sin. When an ancient soul (i.e. one that has been in various bodies) comes down by means of the archons of Heimarmene, they give that soul a cup of oblivion (βύβε) from the seed (σπέρμα) of evil (κακία) filled with various (εἰς ἅπαντα) desires. When the soul drinks from it it forgets everything. That cup of the water (ὕδωρ) of oblivion becomes a body outside the soul, it becomes like (εἰς) the soul in every form (ἐν παντί), resembling it (ὅμοιον), and it is this which is called the counterfeit spirit (ἀντίψυχον πνεῦμα).<sup>257</sup> In Book IV it is a figure called Jalouham, the receiver (παράλημπτῃς) of Sabaoth (the

Demiurge?), who gives the cup of the water of oblivion to the soul.<sup>258</sup>

These parallels suggest that the long recension is casting round to find another role for the Spirit of Barbelo (its interpretation of the Spirit of the Mother) since he has already been sent as a helper to waken Adam, work on and perfect all creation and correct Sophia's deficiency, and has made use of traditions about the Spirit or spirits found in the Untitled Treatise from the Bruce Codex and the Pistis Sophia. The mention in the original of the Spirit's descent, the type of the Pleroma, and the oblivion and wickedness of the grave may have brought these traditions to mind.

A further sign of the secondary nature of the long recension at this point is the fact that in the sequel whereas the short recension has the seed as the object of the spirit's activity,<sup>259</sup> in the long the seed is the subject left dangling with no apparent object; it remains for a time working ( *ἐπ' οὐργεῖν* ).<sup>260</sup> A comparison with the earlier and later passages dealing with the Epinoia's mission in the same terms<sup>261</sup> tends to confirm the hypothesis that the long recension has misunderstood or reinterpreted the basic soteriological pattern which the short recension faithfully reflects.<sup>262</sup> Just as the Epinoia, the good Spirit, was sent out to help Adam and work at the created order, teaching it how to ascend to its perfection ( *πλήρωμα* ), so too the Mother's own spirit has the related if less comprehensive task of awakening those consubstantial with it, the elect seed, from

the oblivion and evil of earthly existence, and preparing them for the final redemptive descent of the Spirit, who as Janssens points out, can only be the Pronoia herself.<sup>263</sup>

There are significant disagreements between the versions over this last motif as well. Whereas BG 64, 6-8, CG II 25, 11-13 and CG IV 39, 9-12 speak of the Spirit coming forth from the holy aeons, CG III 32, 16-18, perhaps as a result of Christian influence, talks of the holy Spirit coming from the great aeons. And whereas the short recension has the Spirit raise them (the Gnostics?) out of deficiency<sup>264</sup> for the restoration of the aeon (i.e. Sophia?) so that it (the aeon?) become holy and free from deficiency,<sup>265</sup> the long speaks of raising it (the seed?) up and healing it of deficiency so that the whole Pleroma should become holy and free from deficiency.<sup>266</sup> Now the long recension betrays a consistent tendency to interpret "Pleroma" as referring to the heavenly realm of the aeons as in Valentinianism,<sup>267</sup> whereas there is no such tendency in the short.<sup>268</sup> Furthermore the Apocryphon does not appear to suggest elsewhere that the heavenly world is deficient or lacking in holiness: it concentrates on the deficiency of the aeon Sophia and her correction through the Spirit from the holy aeons. This will be achieved by the illumination and perfection of the seed, the Gnostics, which the Apocryphon hints is not only the work of the Spirit but also to some extent of Sophia herself.<sup>269</sup> Thus although the long recension makes good sense, it is less preferable than the short here.

The whole pattern and terminology of this saving event (the

Spirit's descent: the awakening (  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\gamma\eta\alpha$  ) of the substance (  $\sigma\upsilon\nu\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}$  ) after the heavenly archetype from oblivion (  $\beta\acute{\iota}\alpha\epsilon$  ;  $\lambda\eta\theta\eta$  ) and evil; the mention of the seed (  $\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha$  ); of the holy Spirit's raising up (  $\tau\omicron\delta\tau\omicron\epsilon\rho\alpha\tau-$  ;  $\epsilon\omega\tau\epsilon\epsilon\rho\alpha\tau-$  ) from deficiency (  $\epsilon\gamma\tau\alpha$  ;  $\epsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\eta\mu\alpha$  ) to perfection (  $\chi\epsilon\iota\kappa$  ;  $\pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\rho\omega\mu\alpha$  ), recall the descriptions of the mission of the Spirit-consort to Sophia,<sup>270</sup> the Epinoia to Adam<sup>271</sup> and Sophia to her seed.<sup>272</sup> Here one can distinguish four redemptive missions: (a) of Sophia's consort; (b) of the Epinoia or holy Spirit (also Sophia's consort?); (c) of Sophia's own spirit and (d) of Sophia herself. These can ultimately be reduced to involve two figures, Sophia's consort and herself, precisely as in the Ophite system described by Irenaeus.<sup>273</sup> The major difference is that whereas the Ophite system highlights Sophia's redemptive role and makes only a passing allusion to her need for redemption,<sup>274</sup> the Apocryphon does the reverse; Sophia appears predominantly as in need of redemption and only faint traces remain of her redeeming role.<sup>275</sup> Both texts, however, as Schottroff argues,<sup>276</sup> have the identical aim of exonerating Sophia from blame for the present state of the cosmos, but they achieve it by diametrically opposed solutions. For the Apocryphon Sophia is deficient, therefore she cannot be a redeemer; for the Ophites Sophia is free of blemish, therefore she is a redeemer.

If there is some correspondence between the Apocryphon and the Ophites of Irenaeus as regards the pattern of redemption, there

is equally some relation as regards not only pattern but also terminology between the Apocryphon and Valentinianism. The original request of Sophia, the consent of the Pleroma and the dispatch of her consort to correct her deficiency<sup>277</sup> recall the pattern found in certain Valentinian texts which know of only one fallen Sophia.<sup>278</sup>

The concepts of awakening; of oblivion; of the seed; of raising up or correcting; of deficiency and perfection, although they do occur in varying combinations and degrees in non-Valentinian Gnostic texts do not seem to occur together as they do here in a manner so reminiscent of their - virtually technical - usage in Valentinianism.<sup>279</sup>

Some of them are indeed the commonplaces of Gnostic mythology (e.g. sleep/awakening, oblivion, deficiency/perfection<sup>280</sup>), but the pattern and grouping; the use largely without explanation; the tendency (particularly evident in CG III) to identify the correction of Sophia's deficiencies with the perfection of the Gnostics and the general trend visible in the long recension towards a closer accommodation with Valentinianism,<sup>281</sup> suggest that the Apocryphon in its present form has come under the influence of Valentinian ideas. This, however, does not rule out the possibility that Valentinianism itself has been influenced by earlier forms of the Apocryphon. In both we have the multiplication of soteriological events and figures representing or repeating the same redemptive pattern at different levels or periods, and thereby expressing the ideas of primal, continuous, and

final or decisive revelation.

The dialogue on the destinies of souls

There now follows in the Apocryphon what appears to be a digression in which John asks the Saviour six questions about the destinies of various types of souls<sup>282</sup> followed by a seventh about the origin of the counterfeit spirit.<sup>283</sup> The Saviour's response to the last follows on quite well from the mention of the descent of the Mother's spirit to work on the seed in that it speaks of the Epinoia awakening the seed,<sup>284</sup> and continues the narrative of the counter-moves of the chief archon and his deputies whereby they create Fate (Heimarmene), cause the Flood, send their angels to seduce the daughters of men, and, when that fails, produce the counterfeit spirit. His involvement in the generation of men and the blinding and hardening of their hearts and minds continues up to the present day.<sup>285</sup> Furthermore, the dialogue passage does not seem to be directly inspired by what precedes it in that it begins to talk about all the souls although there had been no previous mention of the soul as a soteriological factor apart from the passage about the luminaries in the cosmogony.<sup>286</sup> In the anthropogonical section the soul was the product of the archons, and the divine element was the power from the Mother which Ialdabaoth did not share with his offspring but himself inbreathed into Adam.<sup>287</sup> Along with the light-power motif we noted



that of the Epinoia or holy Spirit descending and working on men to ensure their eventual salvation.

Both of these concepts do appear to occur in this passage although, as we shall see, there is some confusion in our texts as to their precise relationship. Thus we hear of the descent of the Spirit of life and its union with the power, which guarantees salvation.<sup>288</sup> But there is virtually no attempt to harmonise the view of the souls and their destinies here with the previous passage mentioning the souls which spoke of the seed of heavenly Seth, the souls of the saints, being set in the third aeon, and the souls of those who knew their perfection but only repented at the end being set in the fourth aeon.<sup>289</sup> There is also no hint in this previous passage of the reincarnation doctrine found in our present section.<sup>290</sup>

Giversen also finds evidence of a digression here, which he characterises as catechesis, a didactic account which could have stood by itself without the question and answer framework.<sup>291</sup> He argues that the term 'soul' in this passage cannot refer to the divine power since none of the latter, apparently, can be lost.<sup>292</sup> This prompts him to ask whether the dialogue is not an interpolation, but one which must be early since it is common to both recensions. His slightly forced conclusion is that this section must have come from the same interpretation as the rest of the Apocryphon; the specific topic necessitates different terminology and the digression can therefore

be well understood as an integrated part of the work.<sup>293</sup> But this is precisely what is questionable. Giversen has not explained why this digression occurs here, nor has he investigated its exact relationship with the rest of the Apocryphon.

The independent existence of just such a form of soteriological dialogue is attested by the Pistis Sophia, much of which is taken up with the Saviour's answers to the questions of his disciples about who will be saved, what will happen to various types of sinners etc. In fact the Pistis Sophia offers the closest parallel to this section of the Apocryphon. Thus Philip asks Jesus if he has turned upside down the bondage of the archons and their Heimarmene for the sake of the salvation of the world and he replies that he has for the salvation of all souls.<sup>294</sup> More significantly, chapters 111, 112 and 131, which deal with what compels a man to sin, present a clear and systematised doctrine of the three elements in man; the power (which is from above and enables man to stand); the soul; and the counterfeit spirit (which derives from the archons of Heimarmene and compels men to sin).<sup>295</sup> Finally chapters 147 and 148 deal with the questions of John about the fate of a man who has committed no sin but who has not discovered the Saviour's mysteries, and of a man who has sinned but has discovered them.<sup>296</sup>

Böhlig suggests that the counterfeit spirit passages in the Pistis Sophia may represent a later addition.<sup>297</sup> He also highlights

fundamental differences between the two accounts. The Pistis Sophia is not concerned with salvation history as the Apocryphon is; it focusses on the fate of the individual after death or before life. The two differ in anthropology: the Pistis Sophia has a fixed scheme whereby the power and the counterfeit spirit are in man from the beginning and there is no mention of the spirit of life, while the Apocryphon is less systematic. The redactor of the former, Böhlig thinks, has detemporalized and dehistoricized the tradition of the counterfeit spirit common to both. Finally the ultimate difference between them is that the Pistis Sophia presents salvation in terms of knowledge of and initiation into mysteries while the Apocryphon presents it in terms of the descent and presence in man of the spirit or Epinoia.<sup>298</sup>

A more distant parallel, but one which reflects an eschatological concern similar to that of the Apocryphon, can be found in the Sophia of Jesus Christ where, in answer to a final question from Mary about the origin and final destination of the disciples, the Saviour delineates the varying grades and resting places of believers according to the degree of their knowledge and their possession of the appropriate token.<sup>299</sup> Other examples of the Saviour replying to eschatological questions of the disciples<sup>300</sup> suggest that we are dealing here with a well-developed genre and that therefore John's questions are not to be seen as perhaps a later addition, but as an integral part of an

independent Christian-gnostic tradition.<sup>301</sup> W.-D. Hauschild would see it as an originally independent non-Gnostic "catechism",<sup>302</sup> but this is to overlook the basic dualism, the Gnostic parallels and the Gnostic concept in this passage of the divine power present in man as the precondition of salvation which requires to be united with the divine spirit.

The reason why this primarily eschatological passage has been inserted here and not at the end of the Heilsgeschichte, as in the Sophia of Jesus Christ for example,<sup>303</sup> is probably to be traced to the mention of the work of the Mother's spirit on the seed (which recalls the earlier passage about the destiny of the seed of Seth, the souls of the saints in the third luminary<sup>304</sup>) and of the eschatological descent of the Spirit. But John's opening question, "will all the souls be saved into the pure light?",<sup>305</sup> while it brings to mind the earlier passage about the luminaries, also explicitly harks back to the description of the realm or nature of the supreme divine beings,<sup>306</sup> and thus establishes the continuity of this section with what has gone before. It is then the seed of the Mother, consubstantial with her Spirit, the Epinoia, implicitly identified by John's question with (some of) the souls of men, which is the object of salvation. But the Saviour, after congratulating the disciple on the perspicacity of his question in a manner characteristic of Gnostic revelation discourses,<sup>307</sup> further qualifies redeeming knowledge: it is hard to reveal to anyone

other than those of the immoveable (or unshakeable) race (γενη).<sup>308</sup>

Thus another way of representing salvation, in terms of the elect race, is presented alongside those of the substance, the seed and the elect souls. Now the immoveable race usually applies elsewhere in the Nag Hammadi Library to the race of the heavenly Seth and appears to be a particular code name or hallmark of the "Sethian" group to which Schenke has assigned the Apocryphon, the Hypostasis, the Gospel of the Egyptians, the Apocalypse of Adam, the Three Steles of Seth, Zostrianos, Melchisedek, the Thought of Norea, the Allogenes and the Trimorphic Protennoia.<sup>309</sup> It occurs a number of times in the Apocryphon,<sup>310</sup> but it either forms part of the Saviour's own address to John,<sup>311</sup> or appears to be a late addition.<sup>312</sup> We may surmise that in the Apocryphon the seed of Seth is to be equated with the immoveable race, both being synonyms for the Gnostic elect.<sup>313</sup>

This evidence plus the fact that both concepts are absent in the Barbelognostic system described by Irenaeus; are not wholly assimilated into the soteriology of the Apocryphon and play a secondary role (very little is made of either heavenly or earthly Seth) might suggest that the Apocryphon has undergone a "Sethian" reworking. However, the short recension does preserve traces of continuity between the immoveable race of the soteriological dialogue and the cosmogony in that, as noted already, it speaks of ascent to

the great luminaries.<sup>314</sup> An earlier version of the Apocryphon may have simply envisaged them as the abodes of the redeemed, or even in some sense as revealer/redeemers, with no mention of the heavenly Seth and his seed.<sup>315</sup> That the long recension reads "greatnesses" in the passage we are discussing<sup>316</sup> may be further indication of its more pronounced tendency to assimilate to Valentinian terminology.<sup>317</sup>

In this section salvation appears to involve (a) the descent of the spirit of life upon or into the soul,<sup>318</sup> and (b) the presence of the power (of the Mother) in every soul with which the spirit must unite,<sup>319</sup> and without which no human being can stand.<sup>320</sup> As already indicated, this does correspond to the two soteriological traditions combined in the main body of the Apocryphon, that of the descent of the Spirit or Epinoia and that of the presence of the power of the Mother, which was originally responsible for Adam raising himself. The latter is also found in the Pistis Sophia. But unlike that work in which the counterfeit spirit is present in man from the beginning and the spirit of life does not appear,<sup>321</sup> in the Apocryphon the fate of man's soul depends on which spirit comes to it, the spirit of life or the counterfeit spirit.<sup>322</sup> This fundamental soteriological pattern suggests that the long recension, which at one point has the spirit of life increase and the power come to the soul and strengthen it,<sup>323</sup> is less preferable than the short, according to which the spirit is brought to the soul after

birth (at Gnostic baptism?), and if it enters the life it strengthens the soul or power.<sup>324</sup> This suggests that neither spirit is present in all the souls, which would weaken Hauschild's argument about the influence of the Qumran doctrine of the two spirits in man, present in equal measure from the beginning, on this dialogue.<sup>325</sup> It also appears to contradict the Apocryphon's previous assertion that the counterfeit spirit was one of the four elements from which material man was composed.<sup>326</sup> Later on in the Apocryphon the counterfeit spirit's origin postdates the Flood!<sup>327</sup>

We will come to this passage in due course but can provisionally explain the contradiction either in terms of different traditions, or, if we wish to defend the integrity of the Apocryphon, in terms of a - not always explicit - distinction between a good or evil spirit within man and the Holy Spirit and his daemonic counterpart who work on man from outside. This kind of distinction also appears to underlie the teaching in the Manual of Discipline from Qumran about the two spirits.<sup>328</sup> As the Epinoia or holy Spirit (and to a more limited extent the Mother's spirit) works to save the seed or power of the Mother, so the counterfeit spirit leads astray men of whose material bodies counterfeit spirit is a constituent part, and who reproduce through it. The body and sex are thus the means by which the evil counterfeit spirit gained entry into man and whereby men are still enslaved.<sup>329</sup> Jewish sectarian ideas about the



two spirits in man may have had some influence on this complex conception,<sup>330</sup> although in its present form it is thoroughly Gnostic and dualist (the supreme God is not responsible for the evil spirit, unlike the Essene view<sup>331</sup>).

Salvation therefore depends on the presence of the spirit of life. From the Saviour's reply to John's second question, it would appear that salvation is not conditional upon the soul's abstention from the passions; the presence of the spirit ensures entire salvation.<sup>332</sup> This precisely reproduces what Irenaeus quotes certain Valentinians as saying; they, the pneumatics, will not be saved by certain actions, but because they are spiritual by nature they will be entirely ( *πάντη τε καὶ πάντως* ) saved.<sup>333</sup> A similar idea occurs in the Valentinian Tripartite Tractate.<sup>334</sup> But, as with Valentinianism, we must not assume that salvation is therefore an automatic process. The soul must become perfect and worthy of assent; it must avoid and be purified from every evil; it must endure everything and complete its struggle (cf. I Cor. 13:7; II Tim. 4: 7); it requires strengthening by the spirit of life and heavenly oversight; must possess the saving knowledge (which not all souls have) and finally must not turn away.<sup>335</sup> These concepts find their parallels in the Valentinian view of the need for the pneumatic seed to be formed, trained, brought up and perfected in this world.<sup>336</sup>

Further, the idea that the soul is saved or led into evil depending on which spirit inhabits it is very reminiscent of the views of Valentinus himself,<sup>337</sup> which are also echoed in Hippolytus' account of the Valentinians.<sup>338</sup> According to Valentinus, the heart is like an inn inhabited by evil spirits, or, when cleansed, by the Father, while in Hippolytus it is a matter of the soul being occupied by demons or by heavenly Logoi. The Ophites of Irenaeus put forward a similar conception: for them it is the holy soul (i.e. the soul which possesses the saving knowledge and the dew of light or spirit or divine substance - all three appear to be synonymous) which is saved. The origin and cause of spiritual and other evil for them is the serpent son of Ialdabaoth created from matter.<sup>339</sup>

If then in the Apocryphon the power of the Mother is the indispensable precondition of life and salvation, and the presence of the Spirit (Epinoia/Zoe?) the effector and assurance of ultimate redemption, which is not an assured possession or automatic process, what role does knowledge play? The term crops up in the context of the problem of those who have not come to know "the All". The reason given for this situation is the activity of the counterfeit spirit. Those ignorant souls led astray by it will be fettered once more (in matter or bodies?) until they save themselves from forgetfulness (βῴλη) and acquire knowledge. In this way they will become perfect and be saved.<sup>340</sup> Knowledge too therefore plays a role although it is

not made clear who imparts it or how this is to be reconciled with the theme of the descent of the spirit of life. On the analogy of the counterfeit spirit's role in leading the soul into ignorance and evil, however, we can perhaps assume that the spirit of life and/or the Saviour is responsible for imparting the redeeming knowledge. The archetype for this would be the mythologumenon of the two trees in Paradise, the counterfeit spirit and the Epinoia. As with the Ophite system, the various concepts (divine substance; spirit; light-power and saving knowledge) are presented without much attempt to harmonise them since this multiplication of motifs is the only way the Gnostics can do justice to the paradox of salvation; their assurance of election ("entirely saved") and their equal awareness that their salvation is not automatic, but is a matter of striving towards the goal of ultimate perfection, a saving knowledge which some inexplicably reject. The eschatological aspects of this dialogue will be dealt with in the concluding chapter.

Further archontic measures and countermeasures: the counterfeit Spirit, Fate, the Flood etc.

The narrative of the Gnostic salvation history is resumed after John's seventh question, about the origin of the counterfeit spirit.<sup>341</sup> The question itself acts as a bridge, and its harmonising character is highlighted by the fact that it does not really belong to the section

about the destinies of the souls and is, in fact, only answered much later.<sup>342</sup> The mention of the Mother or Mother-Father rich in mercy and the holy Spirit working with us and wakening the seed<sup>343</sup> recalls the earlier passage concerning the dispatch of the Epinoia to work at the creaturely realm,<sup>344</sup> and picks up the passage directly before the dialogue on the souls, which spoke of the Mother's spirit working on the seed and the final descent of the Spirit from the holy aeons.<sup>345</sup> The fact that the Metropator and the holy Spirit appear in both recensions without an original principal verb, and the confusion evident in the divergent version in CG III also suggest some discontinuity in the text and the secondary nature of the dialogue on the souls.

As we have already argued, the "Mother" of the short recension should be understood from her activity and attributes as Barbelo, the Metropator of the long recension, although of course the term "Mother" without qualification, namely Sophia, was originally and must ultimately be identified as the consort of the supreme Father. Traces of Sophia's original status and redeeming activity have survived all attempts to distance her from Barbelo and from any kind of redemptive role, and these relics at times contribute to the confusion in our texts.

But despite the confusion, what is being described at this point is a further redemptive action of the Epinoia in close conjunction with

the Metropator, Barbelo. That the long recension describes her as "the Epinoia of the light Pronoia",<sup>346</sup> is probably due to its attempt to accommodate its closing revelation discourse in which the Pronoia/Saviour is the subject.<sup>347</sup> That the spirit is qualified by the long recension as "in every form"<sup>348</sup> may be due not simply to the influence of the Pistis Sophia tradition about the counterfeit spirit<sup>349</sup> but to the same motive; to make room for the threefold descent of the thought (μενέει i.e. ἐπινοία?) of the Pronoia.<sup>350</sup> Perhaps not surprisingly, MacRae finds in this passage the second descent of the redeemer figure of the closing revelation discourse,<sup>351</sup> but some doubt falls on this in the light of the evident tendency of the long recension to accommodate the triple parousia scheme, and of the fact that in her second advent the Pronoia (or Epinoia) does not appear to carry out any saving activity.<sup>352</sup> In our present passage however, the Epinoia successfully wakens the Gnostics and provokes the archontic counterreaction (Fate, the Flood, the angelic seduction of men).

The short recension represents the Epinoia's saving activity somewhat oddly, in terms of awakening or raising up (τοῦ γένε) the seed (σπέρμα) in the thought of the race of the perfect eternal man of light,<sup>353</sup> whereas previously it had been a matter of simply awakening the thought (of Adam).<sup>354</sup> The long recension separates the seed and the thought and has the Epinoia raise up both as well as

the eternal light of the man, a reading which evidently makes little sense and must represent an attempt to avoid the awkwardness present in the short recension.<sup>355</sup> Not only is the latter preferable on textual grounds (lectio difficilior potior), but it does make some sense if we realise that the reference to raising up the seed is a deliberate Gnostic reinterpretation of Eve's words in Genesis 4:25:<sup>356</sup> it is not the physical offspring of earthly Adam and Eve which the Epinoia raises up but the spiritual seed, the offspring of the heavenly Adamas and in particular of his son Seth. This idea has been combined with the more usual soteriological motif in the Apocryphon of the Epinoia awakening the thought of the elect; hence the Epinoia raises up the seed in the thought.<sup>357</sup> Thus CG III 36,24f. surely had the right instinct when it added the phrase "which is immoveable" to the mention of the race, since that phrase, as we noted, characterises the race of the great heavenly Seth, the Gnostics themselves.<sup>358</sup>

Aware that men surpass him in the height of their wisdom, the first archon wants to take control of their power of thought, ignorant of their superior intelligence.<sup>359</sup> We are back once more with the tradition, common to both the Apocryphon and the Ophites of Irenaeus, of man's power of thought as that which represents the divine in him, transmitted from Sophia via the Demiurge. It is this which renders him superior to his creators and which alone is saved.<sup>360</sup> The clause found only in the long recension to the effect that the chief

archon did not know that he would not be able to gain control of men,<sup>361</sup> is further evidence of its tendency to underline the superiority of the spiritual dimension and curtail the power of the Demiurge.

Fate ( *εἰς ἀρχμῶν* ) is produced by the chief archon and his powers according to both recensions,<sup>362</sup> but the long adds that this was the shameful result of the powers' adultery with the Sophia or wisdom of each of them,<sup>363</sup> and continues with a long digression, virtually unparalleled in the short, describing the negative and evil nature of Fate and its universal dominion.<sup>364</sup> A similar negative evaluation of Heimarmene occurs in Zosimus' "On the Letter Omega" in which "Hermes" and Zoroaster are said to have asserted that the race of philosophers was superior to Fate,<sup>365</sup> and in which is related the "Hebrew" and "Hermetic" myth of the enslavement of the spiritual light man in the earthly Adam, the product of Heimarmene,<sup>366</sup> and his liberation from the body and Heimarmene through the advent and continuing redemptive activity of the Son of God.<sup>367</sup> Here too we find the (eschatological?) figure of the counterfeit demon ( *ἀντιμυμιος δαίμων* ), leading men astray by his false claim to be Son of God, and associated with Heimarmene, which traps those who possess merely corporeal over against intellectual ( *νοερός* ) perception ( *ἀκοή* ).<sup>368</sup> Also, in the Untitled Treatise from Codex II, Heimarmene is seen as the fellow-worker with the seven archons who were thrown down upon the earth and produced demons who led men astray by



teaching them magic, spells and idolatry. She originated from the agreement of the gods of justice and injustice, and as a result the world was flung into confusion and error, ignorance and oblivion (  $\bar{\beta}\omega\epsilon$  ). Men served the demons from creation till the consummation and the advent of the true Man.<sup>369</sup>

This last passage appears to bear some relation to the digression in the long recension. In it Heimarmene is begotten by the chief archon and his powers (surely including the righteous and unrighteous rulers of the material body, Jave and Eloim) as the last of the variable bonds, stronger than that which binds gods, angels, demons and men, the source of all evil, forgetfulness (  $\bar{\beta}\omega\epsilon$  ) and ignorance, binding men through time.<sup>370</sup> There is, of course, no exact parallel in the Untitled Treatise to the Apocryphon's conception of the powers' adultery with each other's wisdom (or Sophia) as the origin of Heimarmene; this may be due to the attempt of the redactors of the long recension to give a more satisfactory explanation of its origin in terms of the seduction motif which had already been employed to explain the origin of Jave and Eloim.<sup>371</sup> "Sophia", however, surely cannot refer to Ialdabaoth's mother, who is supposed to have withdrawn above to the Ninth.<sup>372</sup> It must refer, as Giversen's translation correctly suggests, to the wisdom of the powers, or perhaps to Wisdom, the agent of the creator Demiurge of Jewish sapiential literature.<sup>373</sup> There are traces of both conceptions in the Untitled

Treatise. We hear of a Sophia who is in the sixth heaven, who is responsible for the creation of the heavenly constellations, and thus for time and the order of the cosmos,<sup>374</sup> while with the final revelation of the truth through the appearance of the spiritual beings in the archons' realm, it is said that all their wisdoms (  $\text{NCO}\Phi\text{ID NIM}$  ) are put to shame and their Heimarmene found to be under condemnation.<sup>375</sup> This juxtaposition suggests that both the long recension of the Apocryphon and the Untitled Treatise from Codex II are making use of a tradition or traditions which traced the origin of Heimarmene to the wisdom of the archons (perhaps envisaged more mythologically in terms of the archons' intercourse with the figure of Wisdom), and which linked the evils and ignorance in the world with Fate.

The two recensions then concur in summarising the effect of the creation of Fate. Everything is bound by time since Fate is lord over everything.<sup>376</sup> Thus although there is little trace in the short recension of the long recension's conception of Heimarmene's origin and responsibility for evil in the world, its negative view of Fate as fettering all things and of the archontic plan as evil and perverse may have acted as the cue for the development or adoption by the long recension of its particular presentation.

Having thus described the final determinant of human existence, Fate, and its instrument, time, the Apocryphon is free to develop the concept of history, the genuine Heilsgeschichte of the Gnostics, the

earthly race of the heavenly Seth, by further appeal to the opening chapters of Genesis. As we have seen, it entirely reinterpreted the Cain and Abel tradition and made very little of the birth of earthly Seth. But here, in order to depict the further countermeasures of the archons in human history, it makes use of the Jewish mythologumenon based on Genesis 6:2-4 of the intercourse of the angels with the daughters of men,<sup>377</sup> and of details of the Flood narrative in Genesis 6 and 7. However it reverses the order, ignoring the biblical sequence and logic; the Flood is not the consequence of the (fallen) angels' misconduct with the daughters of men. Rather, first the Flood then the angelic seduction are successive - unsuccessful - attempts of the chief archon to destroy mankind, which find their climax in the creation of the counterfeit spirit. The angels are not fallen, nor do they generate giants as in the Jewish interpretation: they are deliberately sent to produce men who will be in the power of the chief archon. Once again we encounter the Gnostic freedom of reinterpretation of scripture, particularly Genesis and its contemporary Jewish interpretation, to accommodate and illustrate their own theology.

Echoing Genesis 6:6 and 17, the chief archon repents of all that had come into existence through him and decides to bring a flood over the whole creation of man.<sup>378</sup> But once again a divine redeemer/revealer comes to the rescue: the greatness of the Pronoia, which

is the Epinoia of light according to the short recension, or the greatness of the light of the Pronoia, according to the long, instructed Noah.<sup>379</sup> The long's reading may simply represent a paraphrase of the short, or the short's allusion to the Epinoia may be an attempt to harmonise this passage with the main body of the Apocryphon. The passage recalls the instruction of Adam through the tree of knowledge, where the long recension adds a reference to the Pronoia and departs from the short over the role of the Epinoia. In the latter it is the Epinoia who instructs (the same verb as in BG 73,1) Adam to eat the knowledge, while the former has the Saviour interject to insist that he taught (the same verb as in CG II 29,2) Adam and Eve, the Epinoia being merely the tree of knowledge.<sup>380</sup> The expression, "greatness of the light of Pronoia", recalls some of the self-designations of the revealer/redeemer in the closing discourse,<sup>381</sup> and thus the long recension might be attempting to suggest obliquely that it was the Saviour himself (the subject of the closing discourse) who revealed the truth to Noah.

Noah, the text continues, unsuccessfully tried to warn men,<sup>382</sup> and there follows a further "correction" of Genesis: not as "Moses" said: "he hid himself (BG)" or "they hid themselves (CG III, II and IV) in an ark", but "he covered himself (BG)" or "they covered themselves (CG III, II and IV) in a place".<sup>383</sup> No such form of words, of course, occurs in Genesis 7: v.7 has Noah go into the ark and v.15 speaks of

them (Noah and his family) going into the ark. However in I Enoch 10: 2 an angel says to Noah: "Hide yourself!" and the Apocryphon may be echoing this kind of pseudepigraphical tradition, or a blend of this and Genesis 7.<sup>384</sup> It adds a further correction: not only Noah but also other men (cf. Gen 7:23 LXX) of the immovable race went into a place and covered themselves with a cloud of light.<sup>385</sup> This does not quite correspond with the previous statement about Noah and, as we have argued above with regard to the immovable race, may represent a later attempt to incorporate specifically Sethian Gnostic tradition.

In the manner characteristic of recipients of revelation in the Apocryphon, Noah recognises his heavenly authority (  $\alpha\upsilon\theta\epsilon\iota\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  ,  $\mu\eta\tau\alpha\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  )<sup>386</sup> along with those with him in the light which illuminated them. This reading, which is found in BG 73, 12-16, seems to make better sense than CG III 38, 5-8 or CG II 29, 12-14 (= CG IV 45, 9-12) in that it appears to be a Gnostic reworking of Genesis 7:23 , "Noah .... and those with him in the ark".<sup>387</sup> As the continuation in the Apocryphon makes clear, the contrast is between the light which illuminates Noah and the Gnostics and the darkness which covers the earth, the Apocryphon's interpretation of the Flood.<sup>388</sup> CG III 38, 5-8 destroys the sense of "those with him" by having a plural subject,<sup>389</sup> and weakens any allusion to Genesis 7:23 by turning the relative clause ("in the light which") into a circumstantial.

The long recension's versions disagree over the number of the principal verb, CG II 29,12 reading "he" and CG IV 45,10 "they", but appear to come together again in a sentence over which the translators (Giversen and Krause) are at total variance and which makes little sense, switching subject in midstream. Giversen translates, "he knew his authority and that of the light was together with him and shone on them",<sup>390</sup> while Krause has "..... and she of the light has pity on hers (erbarmt sich seiner) after she had illuminated them".<sup>391</sup> The long recension's continuation, "because he brought darkness down over the whole earth",<sup>392</sup> although the nearest subject is Noah, must refer to Ialdabaoth. It has perhaps been more influenced by Genesis 7:4 and 10 than the short, which has darkness spread over everything on earth.<sup>393</sup>

Then follows the motif of the angelic seduction of men, based on Genesis 6:2-4 and its interpretation in Jewish (and Christian) circles. But instead of the angels being cast down on the earth for their wickedness, seducing the daughters of men and producing the giants out of hostility to God, as in the Jewish and Christian interpretation,<sup>394</sup> the Apocryphon, as I have indicated already, makes their actions a result of Ialdabaoth's joint plan with them. The descent of the angels is a further counter-measure since the "Flood" failed. Therefore they are sent to the daughters of men to raise up offspring from them for their (the archontic powers') pleasure. But this too

is given a twist: their scheme failed at first.<sup>395</sup> As a result they made the further decision to create the counterfeit spirit in the image of the Spirit which had come down.<sup>396</sup> In describing the former the long recension has the indefinite form "a spirit" and the qualification  $\epsilon\tau\omega\eta\varsigma$ <sup>397</sup> which Krause renders "verachtet" in his index<sup>398</sup> but "widersätzliche" in his translation, while Giversen takes  $\omega\eta\varsigma$  to be a qualitative of  $\omega\omega\omega$ , "to make equal, to imitate", and translates accordingly.<sup>399</sup> The spirit which had come down would appear to be either the spirit of Sophia, the Mother, sent to the descendants of Adam,<sup>400</sup> or the holy Spirit, the Epinoia who wakened Adam and laboured with the Gnostics.<sup>401</sup> That the archons must have seen it to imitate it might militate against the latter identification, since the Epinoia concealed herself from the archons in Adam.<sup>402</sup> Allied to this problem is the awkward point raised by Janssens: how, if the counterfeit spirit was only created after the "Flood", could it have been involved in the creation of material man?<sup>403</sup> One could either, as suggested above, distinguish the good and evil spirits within man, introduced at his creation, and the Holy and Counterfeit Spirits which act upon man from outside and which only appeared later. Or one could see this treatment of the two spirits as a doublet or repetition in terms of salvation history of the reality of man's existential situation; torn by two opposing forces conceived in terms of internal and external, psychological and mythological, archetypal and historical.



As the existence in archetypal man of the Epinoia led to the role of the counterfeit spirit in the creation of his material body, so the descent of the holy Spirit (the Epinoia or spirit of the Mother) on the human race in history led to the creation and activity of the counterfeit spirit in history.

One can fruitfully compare the account in Zosimus in which the conflict similarly takes place on two levels, one within man, one outside him. There is the struggle between the inner spiritual man and the external Adam, created by the archons and Fate, who, in a primal event, enslaved him. Then there is the opposition between the continuous redemptive activity of the Son of God in human history and the hostile endeavours of his counterpart, the counterfeit daemon, who appears later on the scene and claims to be the Son of God.<sup>404</sup> In both cases it is ultimately not the power or inner spiritual man, which belongs to man by nature, which ensures his redemption, but the presence and activity of the Spirit or Son of God awakening the power, freeing the enslaved inner man. Salvation is essentially something which comes to man and thus is a matter of grace. It can be lost.

The Apocryphon then returns to the mythologumenon of the angelic seduction; the angels transformed their appearance into the likeness of the husbands of the daughters of men, a motif found in Jewish and Jewish Christian circles.<sup>405</sup> However, the Gnostic

interpretation again intervenes, although the versions diverge on the details. BG 74, 13-16 records that they (the angels) sated them with the spirit which tormented them in the darkness out of wickedness, while CG III 38, 22-4, which is marred by lacunae, appears to indicate that they filled them with the spirit from them, which is full of darkness, out of wickedness.<sup>406</sup> The long recension (CG II 29, 28-30; CG IV 45, 30-46, 2) appears to agree in beginning with a circumstantial clause (like CG III), "while they filled them with a spirit of darkness", but adds "which they had mingled over them". Tacked on to this is the phrase, "and of (or in) wickedness". The sense, the angelic corruption of men by the counterfeit spirit, is evident even if we cannot now chart how the deviations developed.<sup>407</sup>

Following the motif further, the Apocryphon relates how the angels brought precious metals to men and led them into distractions.<sup>408</sup> The short recension adds the reason, "so that they should not think of their immoveable forethought ( $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\upsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma$ )"<sup>409</sup> which is omitted by the long possibly because it has developed a different view of Pronoia as the second highest heavenly figure with the central role in redemption.<sup>410</sup> The long then has a passage expanding the description of men's seduction into distraction and ignorance,<sup>411</sup> which is evidently an addition. It mentions men being led astray into many errors, growing old and not finding rest or knowledge or the God of truth, which recalls Hebrews 3: 8-11 - which itself is quoting Psalm 95 (94):7-11,

while the reference to the creation being enslaved from the foundation of the cosmos till now could be an echo of Romans 8: 19-22.

The Apocryphon then recounts how the angelic initiative finally succeeds: the angels took women and begot children from the darkness through their counterfeit spirit.<sup>412</sup> They closed their hearts<sup>413</sup> and became hard through the hardness of the counterfeit spirit till now.<sup>414</sup> In this deliberate echo of biblical language<sup>415</sup> the Apocryphon supplies the final characteristic of human existence, the problem of human blindness and rejection of the saving message and the divine revealer/redeemer, the holy Spirit. It is the work of his rival, the counterfeit spirit, who is thus responsible<sup>both</sup> for human reproduction and for men's spiritual lack of perception.

#### The closing revelation discourse and epilogue

The last statement would appear to mark the natural conclusion of the Heilsgeschichte and this is confirmed by the marked divergence of the two recensions at this point. The short, apparently continuing the soteriological exposition, abruptly asserts that the blessed one (f), the Father - Mother (ΤΜΑΔΑΥ ΝΕΙΩΤ) who is rich in mercy, assumes form (BG) or will assume form (CG III) in her offspring (σπερμα).<sup>416</sup> This is followed by the Saviour's pronouncement that at first (ΝΥΟΡΠ) he ascended (or descended? ΕΖΡΑΪ) to the perfect aeon.<sup>417</sup> Thereupon the epilogue proper begins, with both recensions in general agreement that, as is customary in Gnostic gospels, the Saviour gives

instructions to John about the transmission in writing of what he has said to his fellow spirits (  $\delta\mu\sigma\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$  ), namely the mystery (  $\mu\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\iota\omicron\nu$  ) of the immoveable race.<sup>418</sup> But the short recension interrupts the epilogue at this point with the statement, which properly belongs to the dogmatic exposition, as Puech points out,<sup>419</sup> that the Mother came on one occasion before him and what she did in the cosmos was to raise up (  $\tau\omicron\zeta\epsilon\varsigma\epsilon\rho\alpha\tau-$  ) her seed (  $\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha$  ; BG) or deficiency (  $\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\eta\mu\alpha$  ; CG III).<sup>420</sup> The short recension adds the Saviour's promise, actually unfulfilled in the Apocryphon: "I will make known to you (pl. i.e. the disciples?) what shall come to pass".<sup>421</sup> The two recensions then concur in their version of the Saviour's closing instructions to John (in the first person in the short recension, but in the third in the long) to preserve his teaching in writing and keep it safe; his curse upon any who traffic in it for material gain; his commission to John (in the third person in both recensions) of the mystery and ascent to heaven, whereupon John proceeds to proclaim the message to his fellow disciples.<sup>422</sup> The long recension adds the phrase "Jesus the Christ, Amen".<sup>423</sup>

The long recension's version of the epilogue is not broken up as is that of the short, but it follows neatly on from the revelation discourse of the Saviour, identified as the perfect Pronoia of the All, who relates her three descents into the underworld in disguise finally

to awaken the imprisoned Gnostic and seal him with five seals to prevent death from having power over him.<sup>424</sup> The long recension thus begins this discourse in the first person right after the mention of the activity of the counterfeit spirit till now, apparently omitting mention of the Father-Mother taking form, and starts the epilogue (still in the first person) with the Saviour's statement: "Behold I will now go up to the perfect aeon" rather than the past tense of the short.<sup>425</sup>

What is the precise relation of the two recensions? Arai argues that the revelation discourse is a later addition, a Christian interpretation of CG III 39, 11-13 (the Father-Mother taking form in her offspring).<sup>426</sup> He identifies the Father-Mother (or "väterliche Mutter" as he translates  $\text{Ἡ δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἐστὶν}$ ) as Sophia, and interprets her taking form ( $\text{ἐν ἑαυτῇ ἑαυτὴν ἐποίησεν}$ ) in or with her offspring in terms of the Valentinian understanding of the formation of the shapeless and ignorant Achamoth and thus also of the pneumatics.<sup>427</sup> He associates this formation both with the prior passage about the eschatological descent of the Spirit to the seed (CG III 32, 8-22; BG 63, 16-64, 13) and the later passage describing the Mother's raising up of her seed or deficiency (BG 71, 1-5; CG III 39, 19-21). This eschatological formation and perfection of Sophia with her offspring has then been transmuted by the long version into the triple descent of Christ, with the deliberate omission of any reference to the saving action of Sophia

(BG 76, 1-5; CG III 39, 19-21). Arai also argues, however, that in its present form the epilogue of the short version is also not original but that the dislocations and abrupt changes of subject mark an attempt to interpolate and stress the role of Christ as redeemer alongside the original view of Sophia alone as such.<sup>428</sup>

However, despite the ingenuity of Arai's arguments, he is unconvincing at several key points. First of all we would query his identification of the Father-Mother, who will assume form, with the Mother, Sophia, who corrected her deficiencies in the past. We have already argued that the Father-Mother, blessed and rich in mercy, is to be identified with the merciful Metropator, Barbelo.<sup>429</sup> Again why, if, as Arai argues, the teaching of the Apocryphon should properly end with the eschatological restoration of Sophia with her offspring, does the short recension then speak of her action in the past?<sup>430</sup> Now the figure of Barbelo/Pronoia/Metropator is evidently to be identified with the Pronoia, the revealer/redeemer of the revelation discourse. Both are described as the perfect Pronoia,<sup>431</sup> as merciful (  $\pi\omega\gamma\delta\alpha\gamma\tau\eta\eta$  )<sup>432</sup> and as light from or the image of light.<sup>433</sup> Of course the revealer/redeemer of prologue, narrative and revelation discourse is identified as Christ by the long recension, which, as we have seen, has attempted to integrate the discourse with the rest of the Apocryphon (by stressing the importance of the Pronoia) and emphasise the central role of the Saviour by inserting

a previous awakening of Adam by him identical to the awakening of the Gnostic in the discourse. However the identification in the main narrative of the short recension of the figure of Pronoia with Barbelo appears to be secondary, always being introduced by "namely"

(ἐτε τι τε),<sup>434</sup> If the figure of Pronoia is indeed the subject

of the revelation discourse, this might suggest that the whole Pronoia tradition is a later insertion (but a unity), and that the discourse did indeed once form part of the short recension. But Christ himself, as

he appears in the prologue in threefold form as child, young man and old man (i.e. future, present and past?); promising to be with men for all time (cf. Matt. 28: 20); designating himself as Father, Mother and Son come to reveal past, present and future and teach

about the perfect Man,<sup>435</sup> although reminiscent of the polymorphous Christ of apocryphal Acts or the Αἰών figure,<sup>436</sup> also recalls

Barbelo herself as she is depicted in the Apocryphon and more particularly in the Trimorphic Protennoia of Codex XIII, which is evidently

<sup>436a</sup> related to the former. In both Barbelo is the Protennoia, the triple male (child, youth, old man?) with three names (Father, Mother, Son?), the three powers,<sup>437</sup> the image of the invisible Spirit.<sup>438</sup>

In the Trimorphic Protennoia, Protennoia, the revealer/redeemer subject, descends three times, identifying herself before each descent with the same Ego eimi formula as in the Prologue and the revelation discourse in the long recension of the Apocryphon.<sup>439</sup> She does so



to save the spiritual portion of Sophia, the Epinoia, as respectively Father, explaining the past, Mother, revealing the future consummation and judgment, and Son, revealing the truth about himself, proclaiming the five seals and raising up Jesus and his seed.<sup>440</sup> The idea of the five seals, of course, occurs at the conclusion of the revelation discourse in the Apocryphon: Christ sealed the Gnostic (or Jesus?) with the five seals so that death should no longer have power over him.<sup>441</sup> In their descriptions of the descents and the effect on the underworld the two texts are similar.<sup>442</sup>

However perhaps the most interesting thing about the Trimorphic Protennoia in this respect is the way the Protennoia refers at one point to Christ, the Son and Word, her third manifestation, in the third person: he was the first to leave the height and reveal himself and his saving mysteries to those below in darkness.<sup>443</sup> It is later on, in the context of the threefold descent scheme that the Protennoia speaks in the first person as the Word in concealed form, who put on Jesus and raised him to the Father.<sup>444</sup> This ambivalence might help to explain how in the Apocryphon Christ can speak as Barbelo in the prologue, refer to her in the third person in the epilogue in the short recension, and again speak as her in the revelation discourse in the long.

Thus if we examine more carefully the prologue itself and its relation to the closing discourse and epilogue, as Arai has not done

in sufficient detail, we can perhaps find some clues as to whether the revelation discourse is integral to the present Apocryphon or not.

As we have indicated, the statement about the counterfeit spirit hardening people's hearts till now marks the natural conclusion to the salvation history, but it also picks up and corrects the assertion by the Pharisee in the prologue: it was not Christ who led men astray and closed (  $\tau\omega\mu$  ) their hearts, it was the counterfeit spirit.<sup>445</sup>

The Ego eimi formula of Christ in the prologue has its precise parallel in the triple Ego eimi formula of the discourse.<sup>446</sup>

Aspects of the Saviour's appearance in the prologue (light and the world trembling),<sup>447</sup> although of course typical of divine theophanies, do also find an echo in the descents in the revelation discourse,<sup>448</sup> and John's question about why Christ was sent into the world<sup>449</sup> perhaps only finds a full answer in that discourse.

If then Christ is represented as the incarnation of the Pronoia or Barbelo in the prologue of both recensions and in the revelation discourse of the long, and if there is some evidence that the prologue and revelation discourse form a unity, and that the former presupposes something like the latter, how are we to explain the apparent absence of that discourse from the short recension and make sense of the abrupt juxtapositions of the latter? Giversen suggests that the short recension represents "a very brief - and incomplete - digest" of the long, adapting the words of CG II 30, 13f. (  $\text{ΝΕΙΥΟΟΠ ΓΑΡ ΝΥΟΠ}$  )

which begin the narrative of the discourse and those of CG II 31,26f. (ΕΙΝΑ ΒΛΩΚ ΕΞΡΘΙ ΑΠΤΕΛΕΙΟΝ ΝΘΩΩ) which conclude it. The revelation discourse was left out, he suggests somewhat lamely, as a result of editorial revision.<sup>450</sup> Schottroff agrees with Giversen, arguing that the statements of the short recension must be understood as redemptive and that the redeemer's discourse must already have been present in the tradition underlying BG and CG III. She does attempt to offer the more satisfactory reason for its omission that it was felt to be a doublet of Jesus' appearance to John.<sup>451</sup>

However, the real reason may lie in a misunderstanding by the redactors of the short recension of the relationship between the frame story and the central narrative and in particular of the identity of the Saviour. The closing frame story of the long recension presents us with the one revealer/redeemer figure of the Pronoia as Christ, while that of the short distinguishes the Father-Mother (i.e. Barbelo); Christ in the first person; and the Mother who raised up her seed or deficiency. Although the latter might be taken to refer to Barbelo, as CG III appears to understand it by reading "this Mother",<sup>452</sup> the identification with Sophia seems best since (1) the reference is to work achieved in this world and there has been no indication that Barbelo has previously descended; (2) the term "Mother" without qualification virtually always designates Sophia<sup>453</sup> and (3) both

readings, σπέρμα (BG 76,4) and ὁστέον (CG III 39,21) best suit Sophia. The Gnostics are the offspring Sophia raised up (τὰς ἐκ ἐρᾶς; ἀνιστάμεναι?),<sup>454</sup> and more than once we hear that she herself is to correct (τὰς ἐκ ἐρᾶς; διορθώσασθαι?) her deficiency.<sup>455</sup>

Now in the central exposition itself it is the Epinoia or holy Spirit who appears as the recurring revealer/redeemer, but there are traces (more evident in the short recension than in the long) that Sophia too plays a part in salvation. This has been played down by the long, which in its turn has attempted to accommodate the Christ/Pronoia of its frame narrative more thoroughly into the Epinoia scheme than the short by having Christ displace the Epinoia at one point, and by emphasizing the key role of the Pronoia. Furthermore it betrays evidence of a tendency to equate the Father-Mother, holy Spirit and eschatological spirit with one another and with the Christ/Pronoia of the discourse.<sup>456</sup> It may well be that the redactors of the short version, faced with a text containing the revelation discourse of the Pronoia about her triple descent and aware of the evidence of the central exposition, may not have understood the equation Christ = Barbelo = the Pronoia, and insisted that the Pronoia who proclaims "I transformed myself (CG II 30,13; ὡς τὸ μεταμωρφοῦσθαι) in my offspring" is the Father-Mother or eschatological holy Spirit, who has not yet descended, but will take on human form (μορφῇ).

The Pronoia's threefold past descents and ascents were interpreted as Christ's ascension: he was the first vessel of the Pronoia or eschatological spirit, being elevated to the heavenly world to receive illumination and perfection before returning as revealer. Having interpreted the triple parousia scheme in terms of the future descent of the Father-Mother or Spirit, as intimated in the central exposition, and the immediate past ascent of Christ, the third descent into the prison to awaken the Gnostic sunk in oblivion would have to involve the past and be attributed to the only other figure who had descended and been involved in redemptive activity, namely Sophia. Her saving activity of raising her seed<sup>or</sup> correcting her deficiency was thus reemphasized.<sup>457</sup>

In drawing attention to the Valentinian parallel to the idea in the short recension of the Father-Mother taking form or being fully formed, Arai has also opened up an unexpected perspective.<sup>458</sup> That the spiritual seed sown by Achamoth requires formation and that she only enters the Pleroma once the whole seed has been formed and perfected suggests that Achamoth is perfected in and with her seed.<sup>459</sup> If one accepts that  $\tau\mu\delta\delta\gamma\bar{\nu}\epsilon\iota\omega\tau$  translates  $\mu\eta\tau\rho\sigma\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\rho$ , the only other place the Greek term occurs is in Valentinianism where it applies to the Demiurge in view of his being controlled by his mother Achamoth.<sup>460</sup> Again, the abrupt assertion by Christ in the

short recension that at first he ascended to the perfect aeon, recalls the views of Valentinus and those who remained faithful to his teaching: Christ was produced outside the Pleroma and immediately ascended to it as "first-born son".<sup>461</sup> The idea of Sophia correcting her deficiency recalls the Valentinian view of the work of the Paraclete and his angels to correct Achamoth's passions or her seed.<sup>462</sup> We have suggested the possibility of Valentinian influence on the Apocryphon before, but in this case the resemblances are superficial and a matter of similar terminology. Our explanation in terms of varying attempts to reconcile the frame story and the central exposition is preferable.<sup>463</sup>

#### The person and work of the Saviour

We have attempted to demonstrate that the revelation discourse put into the mouth of Christ is an integral part of the present Apocryphon since it forms a unity with the prologue, and since the subject of both bears a distinct kinship to Barbelo in the central exposition. Arai has attempted to prove that Christ has been interpolated into the central non-Christian body of the work by means of the anointing episode (CG II 6, 23-7, 21 and parr.); by his identification with the probably secondary figure of the Autogenes (BG 51, 8ff. and parr.); by his own interjections; and through the revelation discourse and the dialogue about the destinies of the souls

(BG 64, 13-71, 2 and parr.). He has pointed to inconsistencies between the frame story and the central exposition (e.g. Christ is the Father, Mother and Son in the prologue, but they are distinct figures in the main narrative) and to the absence of New Testament allusions in the main body of the work, a claim which is not entirely accurate.<sup>464</sup> Some of this evidence is clearly due to the manifest attempt to harmonise the Christian frame story with the main exposition, but it does not seem possible to argue either that the Autogenes is secondary or that the figure of the Son or Light, who is anointed and with whom Christ is identified, is a later addition, in the light of the evidence of Irenaeus' account of the Barbelognostics, the Gospel of the Egyptians, and the Trimorphic Protennoia. In the first two the Son and the Autogenes are distinct, both playing a major role in the heavenly sphere, and in the third, as in the Apocryphon, the Son or Christ is identified with the Autogenes as a revealer/redeemer.<sup>465</sup> In the first and third we have the motif of Christ being anointed.<sup>466</sup> These texts seem to be grappling with two different triadic conceptions of the Godhead as composed (1) of Father, Autogenes and Adamas and (2) of Father, Mother and Son, and have sought the heavenly figure who would most deserve the title "Christ" and establish its heavenly origin and aetiology. As the true prophet, Adam, of the Pseudo-Clementines, after his continuous revealing activity, received eschatological anointing (as Christ?),<sup>467</sup> so the



heavenly Son and Light-Man, prior to his creating and redeeming activity, received protological anointing. However, it is evidently the case that the real revealer/redeemers of the main exposition are the Epinoia, the eschatological Spirit (perhaps itself the Epinoia) and to some extent Sophia herself, rather than the Son/Christ/Autogenes.

If then the central body of the work apparently reveals limited and ambiguous evidence of Christian influence, what of the frame story, and in particular the revelation discourse? Does the latter represent a Christianization of an entirely independent non-Christian motif as Schottroff<sup>468</sup> and MacRae<sup>469</sup> argue? In it the Saviour, who, as Giversen points out, is never designated by the titles which occur elsewhere in the Apocryphon (Christ, Jesus, Saviour, Lord),<sup>470</sup> is described as having descended three times to the middle of the darkness (CG II 30,17.25.36) or of the prison (30,19; 31,3f.) or interior of the underworld (30,26; 31,1), returning twice up to his light root (30,30) each time unrecognised (30,20f.) but causing the foundations of chaos to tremble (30, 19f.; 30, 27f.). The first two sorties appear to have been unsuccessful, which might suggest that MacRae's attempt to identify them with the saving actions of the Epinoia breaks down.<sup>471</sup> The third involves the Saviour entering the prison of the body (31,3f.), calling and awakening the Gnostic from oblivion (31, 5f.) and sealing him with five seals (31, 33f.).

Despite the lack of concreteness in this picture and its freedom from the usual Christian depictions of Christ, it would appear to be alluding to some sort of "incarnation" and ritual act on the part of the Saviour. As MacRae admits, there is nothing corresponding to this in the main narrative, and his attempt to equate it with the Saviour's present revelation is a little forced.<sup>472</sup> Giversen's suggested identification of the recipient of the call as John<sup>473</sup> also breaks down on the fact that the recipient in the discourse is spoken of in the third person and that the description of the Saviour's action and the Gnostic's response does not exactly correspond with those of Christ and John in the prologue.

As suggested already, the best parallel is not the continuous activity of the Epinoia, which the redactors of both recensions have nevertheless attempted to reconcile in different ways with the triple descent scheme, but the triple descent of the Protennoia in the Trimorphic Protennoia, or the similar schemes apparently involving a male figure in the Gospel of the Egyptians (Seth descends in connection with the Flood, the conflagration and the judgment of the archons)<sup>474</sup> and the Apocalypse of Adam (where the Phoster descends three times to save his race from flood, fire and the archons).<sup>475</sup> All these apparently represent the third descent in terms of putting on or appearing in a body which implicitly or explicitly is that of Jesus.<sup>476</sup> All four texts connect this third descent with the idea of sealing in

the context of the proper spiritual understanding of Gnostic initiation,<sup>477</sup> and all four works have been characterised as "Sethian", combining a stress on the figure of heavenly Seth and his perfect immovable race with - generally - Barbelognostic cosmogonical traditions.<sup>478</sup> Finally, it is perhaps significant that this triple parousia scheme does not quite fit either the Apocryphon, as we have noted, or the Apocalypse of Adam, where only the third descent of the Phoster is mentioned and it is difficult to find a suitable place for the first two.<sup>479</sup>

In the light of this unsuccessful grafting operation, what is the significance and background of what is evidently a widespread Gnostic soteriological motif? Is it at all influenced by Christian ideas?<sup>480</sup> The attempt in the Gospel of the Egyptians and the Apocalypse of Adam to relate the first two advents to pivotal events of Old Testament salvation history (the Flood and the destruction of Sodom) seen as being of universal significance, and the third to the coming of Christ, clearly suggests that the motif is being employed to do justice to the Gnostic paradox that revelation must have been continuous in history yet has not become decisive till the Christ event.<sup>481</sup> In the narrative of Apocryphon this paradox is represented by the continual reappearance of the Epinoia to repeat what had apparently been a completed redemptive action over against the final eschatological redemption by the Spirit. The narrative form, as we have attempted to show against Schottroff, is required to give a

complete explanation of man's existential situation, and the paradox of now and not yet is expressed by the use of different and often inconsistent traditions about Spirit.

If the motif represents the attempt to combine the ideas of past or continuous revelation with the reality of decisive revelation in the present, it can be interpreted in terms of an historical scheme, as with the Gospel of the Egyptians and the Apocalypse of Adam, or more psychologically and mythologically, as in the case of the Apocryphon and Trimorphic Protennoia, where historical detail is lacking. Their use recalls the Christian Descensus ad inferos motif, as Puech has noted in the case of the former.<sup>482</sup> Here the Saviour descends in disguise to chaos or the underworld, which is the Gnostics' interpretation of this world.<sup>483</sup> Bousset argued that this descent in disguise was an independent Gnostic mythologumenon which directly influenced the orthodox Christian motif of the Descensus.<sup>484</sup> Paul's words in I Cor. 2: 7ff. were so obscure that they were rather to be understood from the Gnostic motif than as its basis,<sup>485</sup> and the frequent allusions to Christ's descent to Hell in the New Testament suggest that the idea already existed.<sup>486</sup> The passage in I Peter 3:18f., notes Bousset, is distinguished from all the rest in that it supplies a distinct motive, to preach to the spirits in prison, which recurs as the predominant understanding in the early Christian Fathers.<sup>487</sup>

Finally we should note Bousset's reference in a footnote to the passage in Ecclesiasticus 24:32 preserved only in Latin which reads: "I (Wisdom) will penetrate all regions deep beneath the earth and will visit all that sleep and will enlighten all that hope upon the Lord", as evidence for the possible transmission of the idea to Christian circles by way of Jewish apocalyptic (sic!).<sup>488</sup> As he himself notes, there is no actual descent to Hell in the Gnostic sources he had cited to illustrate the Saviour's coming down in disguise: the former is no longer necessary if this world comes to be regarded as chaos and the underworld, the Saviour's final destination.<sup>489</sup> But he has failed to notice that one of the earliest accounts of Christ's descent to Hades to proclaim salvation outside the new Testament is found in Irenaeus' section on Marcion: when Christ descended to Hell (cum descendisset ad inferos) it was the Old Testament sinners who ran to him; the righteous thought God was testing them again and so did not believe his proclamation (or preaching? annuntiationi eius).<sup>490</sup> Both the Apocryphon and the Trimorphic Protennoia represent the Saviour descending in disguise to the underworld to proclaim salvation to those in chains and darkness, and so this evidence might suggest contra Bousset that the Gnostics were already aware of the descensus motif as found in I Peter 3: 18f. and had adapted it to their own use.

But Bousset's citation of the Wisdom text is perhaps more

apposite, for certain aspects of the hypostasis of Wisdom may well illuminate the figures of the Pronoia of the Apocryphon and Protennoia of the Trimorphic Protennoia. The verse from Ecclesiasticus (if original) could have been interpreted by a Gnostic as referring to a triple visit by the heavenly Sophia to awaken and save the Gnostic elect. Proverbs, and above all the Wisdom of Solomon, have several passages which could suggest the creative and redeeming role of the hypostasis of Sophia to a Gnostic reader.<sup>491</sup> Thus in the latter Sophia is said to have in her a holy beneficent spirit permeating all spirits;<sup>492</sup> she describes herself as a radiance of eternal light, a mirror of God's activity and an image of his goodness,<sup>493</sup> who is present in all things and governs all things and appears to be equivalent to God's forethought.<sup>494</sup> Age after age she enters into holy souls and makes them God's friends and prophets.<sup>495</sup> Solomon begs God to dispatch her from heaven to labour at his side;<sup>496</sup> only because God gave Wisdom and sent his holy spirit (the two appear to be synonymous) from highest heaven did men come to know God's plan and be saved by Wisdom.<sup>497</sup> Even more interesting is the Heilsgeschichte of chapter 10 and following, in which the series of Wisdom's redemptive acts is chronicled from Adam through Noah to the Exodus, and men's folly and ignorance of God as demonstrated by idolatry is castigated. In a valuable article, George MacRae has drawn attention to the striking series of parallels between the Sophia of Jewish Wisdom literature

and her Gnostic equivalents such as Barbelo, the Epinoia, Sophia Zoe etc.<sup>498</sup>

Thus the figure of Wisdom appears to underlie not only the Saviour/Pronoia of the Christianized frame story of the Apocryphon and the Protennoia of the Trimorphic Protennoia, but also Barbelo, the Epinoia, and Sophia herself of the central exposition, and this fact tends to confirm what the Apocryphon itself, if obliquely, suggests, as Janssens and Schenke have argued, that these various figures and abstractions were, and are, ultimately one: Sophia herself, the consort and agent of the Father in creation, revelation and redemption.<sup>499</sup>

This hypothesis is strengthened if we consider the Ophite system described by Irenaeus, which in some ways is closer to the Jewish Wisdom tradition. In it Sophia is depicted as descending (cf. I Enoch 42), redeeming herself, and creating the visible heaven and the universe beneath, the latter by means of her son, the Demiurge, and his six offspring. In a continuous struggle with him throughout history she becomes the agent of continuous revelation and redemption, protecting the divine element, the dew of light, speaking through the prophets and proclaiming the imminent descent of the Son of Man, Christ, her consort who comes to bring decisive revelation and redemption, uniting with Sophia and descending as a unity on Jesus. Sophia is here creator, revealer and redeemer, but she is not the consort of



the Father; she is the inferior offshoot of the supreme Sophia-figure, the Holy Spirit. This was the Ophite solution to the problem of representing the highest female deity as responsible for this imperfect world. The solution of the Apocryphon and Trimorphic Protennoia was also to distinguish between Barbelo or Pronoia (Sophia could not be the name of the supreme female deity), and Sophia, who was removed as far as possible, physically and genealogically. But unlike the Ophites, almost all traces of Sophia as a redeemer were removed in the Apocryphon. Instead the abstraction Epinoia, the complement or antithesis of Pronoia,<sup>500</sup> was developed to represent the redemptive rôle of Sophia in association with the Mother-Father, Barbelo, identified as the Saviour. The artificial nature of this procedure is evident from a comparison with the Trimorphic Protennoia which brings out the pejorative sense of Epinoia; "Epinoia of the light" is simply a synonym for the fallen Sophia,<sup>501</sup> and the Protennoia or Barbelo represents Sophia as redeemer, come to rescue her lost portion of spirit.

But is the role of Christ in the Ophite system, the Apocryphon and the Trimorphic Protennoia therefore the result of the Christianization of a non-Christian Jewish-based Gnostic Sophia-myth as Schenke and others would argue?<sup>502</sup> He would see in the second of the Three Steles of Seth (CG VII,5) the classic form of what he classifies as one of the archetypes of the Gnostic redeemer myth;

Sophia as Mother rescuing her children. It clarifies what is obscured in other texts, that Sophia is Barbelo, the heavenly consort, and this conception influences the details of The Thunder (CG VI, 2) which itself represents the classic form of the Gnosticizing of the Jewish Sophia concept. In the Apocryphon, Schenke argues, the Pronoia is another name for Sophia, and the Ophite system of Irenaeus adv. haer. I 30 combines a pre-Christian section with Sophia as redeemer (3-11a) with a Christian-gnostic (11b-14) in which Sophia and Christ together redeem men.

However it is surely significant that in both the Ophite system and the Apocryphon Sophia represents the principle of continuous or preparatory revelation and cannot guarantee decisive redemption, which requires the descent of Christ or her consort respectively. Schenke fails to mention that the subjects of the first and third steles of the Three Steles of Seth, Adamas and the Father, are equally identified as Saviours, Adamas as Father saving his race and the seed of Seth, the preexistent Father as saving by his fiat.<sup>503</sup> Moreover the Sophia myth, whether influenced by Jewish Wisdom literature or the Isis aretologies, cannot per se explain the triple descent scheme itself and certain fundamental characteristics of it, such as the incarnational presentation of the third descent and its sacramental or ritual character. These aspects occur not only where a Sophia figure (Pronoia, Protennoia) is the subject but also

where the subject is male (Christ, heavenly Seth, the Phoster, Derdekeas). It is perhaps significant that the scheme always has a masculine component but not always a feminine. The idea of three descents may owe more to the tradition of heavenly Seth intervening at key points in history to save his descendants, the immoveable race, which Schenke puts forward as his second archetype of the Gnostic redeemer.<sup>504</sup> It is Christian-gnostic texts and groups which reveal a particular interest in the figure of Seth as a heavenly redeemer, the Son of Man and progenitor of the elect race of the Gnostics.<sup>505</sup> The Christian-gnostic Sethians of Epiphanius interpret Christ as descending from Seth's race, and indeed as "Seth himself, who both now and then visits ( ἐπιφαιτᾶν ) the human race" sent down by the supreme female deity.<sup>506</sup> This conception at once recalls the Pseudo-Clementine view of Christ as Adam, the true prophet who, from the beginning of the aeon changing shapes and names, returns till he comes to his own times,<sup>507</sup> and the view of the Son of God in Zosimus, coming in various guises to free the trapped Gnostics.<sup>508</sup>

Again, the attempts to relate the first two missions to the Flood and destruction of Sodom by fire in Christian and non-Christian Gnostic texts;<sup>509</sup> the indications of the incarnation, baptism and passion of the Redeemer;<sup>510</sup> the concern for Seth, who in the Gospel of the Egyptians becomes incarnate in Jesus;<sup>511</sup> and the perpetual

reference to redemption from death and destruction by baptism or sealing understood spiritually,<sup>512</sup> only make sense in a Christian context, or in a milieu aware of contemporary Christian speculations about Seth and his undefiled race. These included the legend of the two steles his race set up to preserve his secret teaching from flood and fire.<sup>513</sup> The idea of a third mission to judge the archons and rescue the immoveable race of Seth is a natural Christian consequence, as is the identification of Seth with Christ.

Analysis of the Apocryphon thus reveals a variety of soteriological theories. In the central narrative, Barbelo and her emanation, the Epinoia or Zoe, on the one hand, and Sophia, on the other, represent the two aspects of Sophia as undefiled redeemer and salvator salvandus. Combined with this Sophia theory is a kind of spirit soteriology in which the divine element or spirit in man (to which is opposed a counterfeit spirit also immanent in him) is worked on by a heavenly Spirit as a kind of continuous revealer/redeemer in preparation for the eschatological descent of the Holy Spirit, who brings decisive revelation and redemption. The dialogue on the souls represents a variant tradition in that in it the spirit of life, the principle of decisive revelation and redemption, has as its counterpart the counterfeit spirit. Souls are saved or led astray depending on which spirit descends upon them. There is also some

hint of the Son, Christ, identified with the Autogenes, as playing a soteriological role, and of the idea of the immoveable race of the heavenly Seth. But Christ and the immoveable race appear to belong more to the frame narrative. The latter represents another form of Sophia soteriology in which Christ appears as the incarnation of Sophia/Barbelo/Pronoia, the Father the Mother and the Son, who descends three times, the third time in bodily form to awaken the Gnostics, the immoveable race (of Seth), and assure them by sacramental means of their ultimate salvation. What unifies these varied traditions is that they all attempt to express the paradox of revelation and salvation arising from the Gnostic's present assurance of salvation: how to present it as something which must have taken place in the past and which continues; which is decisive in present experience, but not complete till the consummation.

We can best understand these theories against the background of incipient and developing Christian speculations about the origin, nature and redeeming function of Christ. The Gnostics have made use of the material, predominantly Diaspora Jewish, which the Christians were using simultaneously or shortly before, to develop their own characteristic Redeemer concept. Thus the Christians of the second century combined speculations about the hypostasis of Wisdom, God's agent and collaborator in creation and the redemption of his people Israel, with those of God's Word and Holy Spirit to

construct their Christology. Christ is God's Wisdom or God's Holy Spirit who of old inspired the prophets (continuous revelation), or he is God's immanent and expressed Reason (Logos) sowing seeds in men from the beginning (continuous revelation). Or again Christ is Adam, inspired by God's holy spirit of knowledge, returning again and again till now (continuous revelation). There is an interesting ambiguity in an early apologist like Justin about the precise distinctions between God's Word and his Wisdom, although he does affirm the Trinitarian formula of Father, Son and Holy Spirit.<sup>514</sup> Justin's Word and Wisdom Christology is in fact an attempt to solve the problem which equally faced the Gnostics: how to reconcile the ideas of a decisive revelation with those of a primal and continuous one.

Again, the Gnostics have their own trinity of Father, Mother or Holy Spirit, and Son, whose successive appearances (Trimorphic Protennoia) or incarnation in Christ (Apocryphon) recall the modalist Monarchian argument that Christ was one mode of the appearance of the one Godhead of Father, Son and Spirit.<sup>515</sup> The New Testament conceptions of Christ as the creator Son of Man, as second spiritual Adam humbling himself, descending incognito but being acknowledged by heaven at his baptism, have their Gnostic counterpart in the Sethian view of heavenly Seth, Son of Adamas and Father of the elect race, descending in disguise to reveal and redeem in the

three ages of the world (Flood, conflagration, present age) climaxing in the incarnation and God's public adoption of the one who would baptise in spirit and fire (Matt.3:11) . The water baptism of orthodox Christians (and Elchasaites?) or the fire baptisms of some Gnostics<sup>516</sup> are inferior to the spiritual baptism of Seth/Christ and his race.<sup>517</sup> There may even be a distant correlation between Christian baptism (triple immersion in the names of Father, Son and Spirit respectively) and the triple descent schemes of the Apocryphon and Trimorphic Protennoia etc. As we have argued, Christ's descent to Hell to preach salvation may well have influenced Gnostic conceptions of the redeemer's descent to this world.

Thus although the Gnostics may use pre-Christian ideas and traditions such as that of Sophia, the heavenly Anthropos, perhaps even Holy Spirit etc., and although texts like the Apocryphon and the Ophite system can appear to have been Christianized, this does not necessarily mean that in their original form they are pre-Christian or totally unaware of and uninfluenced by Christian ideas, if that original form can be reconstructed. The understanding of the role of Barbelo/Epinoia/Sophia as redeemer; the polyvalent conception of holy spirit; and the idea of heavenly Son of Man form Gnostic counterparts of contemporary Christian attempts to understand the person and work of the one who had brought decisive revelation and salvation. For orthodox Christians of the early centuries "Christ"



was simply the title for the incarnate Word or Wisdom or Holy Spirit or Angel or Son of God. That attempts are made in Gnostic texts like the Apocryphon to identify Christ with the third member of the Gnostic triad, or with other heavenly beings, need not necessarily be taken as evidence of Christianization: Christians were doing exactly the same thing when they identified Christ with the hypostatized Wisdom or Word of Jewish tradition. The difference between Gnostic and Christian approaches is that whereas the Christian tendency was to unite the speculations to refer to the one figure of the incarnate Son, the Gnostic tendency was increasingly to split up the redeemer to distinguish heavenly redeeming Sophia, Primal Man and Holy Spirit from fallen defective Sophia, dismembered Primal Man and man's innate spirit as a mere capacity for redemption. The plural Sophias and Christs of Valentinianism and the Manichean plethora of redeemer figures mark the apogee of this.

### Conclusion

Our analysis of the soteriology and Christology of the Apocryphon and related texts has suggested that what unites the endless variety of theories and motifs selected is a certain understanding of the paradoxical character of salvation for the Gnostic. In his own experience he is assured of it; he has received the "call", the revelation from outside which reminds him of his heavenly origin. "Be what you are!"

is the message. Thus he can express this in terms of the elect seed or race or divine substance, all of which occur in the Apocryphon. But the Gnostic also is only too well aware that he is not freed from the constraints of the body, sex, generation, matter, the moral conventions of his society, and Fate. Salvation has to be worked at by denial of the lower self and distancing one's true self from the world. Thus, over against the idea of the divine power (presumably in all men), the Apocryphon sets the concept of the divine spirit which has to descend for the Gnostic to achieve complete salvation. In rivalry with this is a counterfeit spirit seen as both innate and as an external power responsible for the ignorance and blindness of those who have not come to the saving knowledge. Thus the Apocryphon can make use of the theme of the soul as equivalent to the divine power, saved by the descent on it of the spirit of life.

The terminology for salvation may at times echo and perhaps be influenced by Valentinianism, but there is no threefold division of mankind: only that between those who are saved at once or over a period, and those who reject the saving knowledge and blaspheme the Holy Spirit. For the Apocryphon, the concept of a revealer/redeemer or series of revealer/redeemers responsible for primal, continuous and decisive revelation is fundamental. Man has in the divine power or the soul only the precondition of salvation: revelation - which is in essence redemption - must come from outside, and originally from a divine

figure. Unlike the Valentinian plurality of Christs, the Apocryphon has a plurality of Sophia figures. Underlying both the frame story and the main narrative is the concept that Sophia herself as the consort of the transcendent Father is, as the fallen Sophia, responsible for this universe as it is, but remains the undefiled Redeemer, the First Man, the Pronoia, the Father-Mother-Son of whom the Saviour, Christ, is the historic incarnation. But the whole tendency of the Apocryphon is to exonerate Sophia and separate her as fallen Primal Man and Salvator salvandus from her as supreme Man and undefiled Redeemer. That the erring Sophia could ever be a salvator is increasingly denied.

That salvation must be decisive in human experience and history is expressed by the concept of the presence of the Saviour in a body and by his sacramental actions which the Apocryphon and other texts employing the triple descent scheme allude to. The frame story of the Apocryphon and related elements in the central narrative may represent the explicit Christianization of a non-Christian text, but the Sophia myth of that narrative and of the Ophites of Irenaeus' account seems to emerge from a milieu which is aware of and influenced by the early Christian speculations about Christ, Wisdom, the Holy Spirit, etc. Varying interpretations of Sophia as redeemer unite the frame story and the central narrative, suggesting that the revelation discourse, although a later addition, yet belongs to the

same tradition. The short recension has apparently misunderstood its relation to the rest of the work and largely omitted it, but in other respects it often retains traces of the original. The long again shows a tendency to creative interpretation, drawing on other traditions, developing the motif of creation in the image, attempting to assimilate the revelation discourse and emphasize its Pronoia tradition. There are further signs of its tendency to spiritualise and to develop the negative side of Ialdabaoth.

Notes to Chapter 4

1. Iren. adv. haer. I 21,4 (Harvey I 186).
2. GTr CG I 18,4-11; cf. 24,28ff. and 16,31 - 17,4.
3. CH I 18.
4. Ibid., 21.
5. ApocAd CG V 76,21ff.
6. Cf. the comments of Isidore, Basilides' son in Clem. Alex. Strom. VI 6,53,4.
7. CH I 21f.
8. Cf. Gnosis vol. I pp.2ff.; K.Rudolph, "Gnosis und Gnostizismus: ein Forschungsbericht", ThR 36 (1971),p.8; G.W.MacRae, "Sleep and Awakening in Gnostic Texts" in Le Origni, pp.496-507.
9. For a vivid example of this theme cf. GTr CG I 22,2-20.
10. Cf. "Der gnostische Anthropos", p.234.
11. In RGG<sup>3</sup> II 1652,1657. On this see H.-M. Schenke, "Die neutestamentliche Christologie und der gnostische Erlöser", in Gnosis und Neues Testament (ed. K.-W. Tröger), Berlin 1973, p.208.
12. Cf. The Gnostic Religion, pp.48-91.
13. "Gnostic Ideas on the Fall and Salvation", Numen 11 (1964), pp.13-74, esp. pp.34-41.
14. Cf. G. Quispel, "La conception de l'homme dans la gnose valentinienne" in Gnostic Studies I, pp.37-57, esp. p.50 where he cites Tert. adv. Val. 29: spiritalem ex Seth de obvenientia superducunt, iam non naturam sed indulgentiam, ut quos Achamoth de superioribus in animas bonas depluat.

15. On  $\phi\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\iota\ \epsilon\omega\zeta\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron\varsigma$  (the force of the participle has not always been observed) in the heresiologists cf. Iren. adv. haer. I 6,2f. (Harvey I 54-8); Exc. ex Theod. 56,3 (Sagnard 172); Clem. Alex. Strom. II 10,2; II 5,1f.; IV 89,4; V 33; Orig. de Princ. III 4,4f.; Comm. in Joh. II 14; Epiph. Pan. XXXI 7,6-11. See also Basilides' view in Clem. Alex. Strom. V 3, 2-3. On this idea in Bultmann cf. Das Evangelium des Johannes, Göttingen 1941, 1962<sup>2</sup>, pp. 21-4, 96f., 114, 240 (Eng. trans. G.R. Beasley-Murray, R.W.N. Hoare, J.K. Riches, Oxford 1971, pp. 28-31, 64ff., 135 n.4, 250f.); Theology of the New Testament I, London 1952, pp. 168, 181-3. See also Zandee, "Gnostic Ideas", pp. 18, 41, 43, 46; W. Schmithals, Gnosticism in Corinth (trans. J.E. Steely) Nashville/New York 1971, p. 28; H.-M. Schenke in Umwelt des Urchristentums I, Berlin 1971<sup>3</sup>, p. 379.
16. "Animae naturaliter salvandae: zum Problem der himmlischen Herkunft des Gnostikers", in W. Eltester (ed.), Christentum und Gnosis (BZNW 37) 1969, pp. 65-97. On this see Rudolph ThR 36 (1971), pp. 12f.
17. CG I 119, 16ff.
18. "The Valentinian Claim to Esoteric Exegesis of Romans as Basis for Anthropological Theory", Vig. Chr. 26(1972), pp. 241-58.
19. Cf. e.g. Iren. adv. haer. I 6,1 (Harvey I 52f.); 7,5 (Harvey I 65).
20. For a balanced summary of this see Rudolph, Die Gnosis, Göttingen 1978, pp. 134f.
21. CG II 127, 16f.
22. So e.g. Quispel, "Der gnostische Anthropos", p. 234; Colpe, Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule, pp. 30, 198; Schmithals, Gnosticism, p. 30 n. 12. But cf. Colpe's revised view in "New Testament and Gnostic Christology", in Religions in Antiquity (Essays in Memory of E.R. Goodenough), Leiden 1968, pp. 227-243, esp. p. 242.
23. Art. cit., p. 208.
24. Die Gnosis, pp. 136, 141f.

25. On this see especially Bousset, Hauptprobleme ch.6, pp.238-76; Reitzenstein, Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium, Bonn 1921; Colpe, Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule and Rudolph, ThR 36 (1971) pp.11f. and Die Gnosis pp.139f.
26. "Zur Christologie des Apokryphons des Johannes", NTS 15 (1968/69), p.318.
27. Der Glaubende, p.99. However she argues that the Apocryphon is non— rather than pre-Christian, *ibid.*, p.7.
28. *Art.cit.*, p.214.
29. *Ibid.*, p.10.
30. *Art.cit.*, pp.211f. On this theme of primal and continuous revelation cf. Rudolph, Die Gnosis, pp.142-6.
31. *Ibid.*, p.217. cf. Rudolph, Die Gnosis, pp.162f.
32. *Ibid.*, pp.162-5.
33. Cf. AJ CG II 30,32-31,25; GEgypt CG III 63,4-64,3; ApocAd CG V 76,8-77,18; 83,4-7; 84,4-23; ParShem CG VII 30,21-32,24.
34. Cf. e.g. AJ BG 64,5f.; GEgypt CG III 54,9f.; ApocAd CG V 76,7; 83,4; 85,22; ParShem CG VII 28,12f. 22 ( γενεά ). Cf. 31,2; 32, 29 etc.
35. Cf.e.g. the views of the Sethians in Epiph. Pan.XXXIX 31-3,5 (Holl 2,72.15-74.20) and the concept of Christ as the true prophet returning under various guises in Ps.Clem.Hom. III 20,2 (ed. B. Rehm, GCS 42, Berlin 1953, 64, 4-7).
36. Cf. e.g. AJ CG II 15,1-4.
37. Cf. e.g. OnOrWld CG II 112,25-113,5.
38. Cf. e.g. Iren. adv.haer. I 30,6 (Harvey I 232).
39. Cf. e.g. OnOrWld CG II 113,5-10; SJC BG 103,10-104,6; 119,2-16; TrimProt CG XIII 40,22-29.
40. Iren.adv.haer. I 30,6 (Harvey I 232).



41. AJ CG II 19, 15-32; CG IV 29,25-30,5. Cf. CG II 14,18-24; CG IV 22,23-23,2.
42. Apocryphon, p.165. Janssens (Muséon 84 (1971), p.411) is clearly right to identify the Metropator as the Pronoia, Mother of the aeons and Father of all men. In what appears to be the only other occurrence of the term (Iren. adv. haer. I 5,1 (Harvey I 42), the Ptolemeans call the Demiurge "Metropator (μητροπάτωρ)" because the Mother (who is in some respects equivalent to Barbelo) secretly moved him. Cf. Tert. adv. Val. 18 (Kroymann 3,197.16). See above p.49 n.82.
43. CG III 36,20 has a lacuna but appears to read "her whose (mercy?) is rich (Ναυε)". The text has ΤΕΤΝΑΥΕ ΠΕΕΕ [ ]. Krause (p.102 ad loc.) suggests reading ΠΕΕΝΔ [ ]. CG IV 43,9f., although very fragmentary, appears to correspond to CG II 27,33f.
44. Although the parallels CG III 15,19-21 and CG II 10,17f. have no reference to Zoe, they read "the mother of all living" and "the mother of the living", both of which are evidently dependent on Gen.3:20. This same identification of the holy Spirit as Zoe and the Epinoia of light may help to explain the very confused passage in which Adam is awakened by the Epinoia (BG 59,20-60,16; CG III 30,1-14; CG II 23,5-24; CG IV 35,30-6) and alludes to Gen. 2:23f. and 3: 20. The above equation of Zoe and the Epinoia of light, plus the parallel evidence of NatArch CG II 89,11-17; OnOrWld CG II 115, 31-116,8 where Adam calls the spiritual Eve "the mother of the living" because she gave him life, suggest that the original form read (as in CG III 30,10-14): "Because they sent the consort of the Mother to correct her deficiency, therefore Adam called him (ie. the Epinoia, the consort): 'Zoe, the mother of the living'". The future tenses of the Genesis quotation and the fact that the Mother (Sophia) is still imperfect have led the redactor of BG to change the past into a future, while the future tenses and the feminine gender of the Epinoia have led the redactor of CG II (and IV) to interpret the consort as Sophia. The redactor may have identified the holy Spirit, "the mother of the living" of CG II 10,17f. as Sophia herself. In which case the naming by Adam would no longer make sense and therefore that too must have been changed. However the whole passage remains a crux interpretum!
45. Cf. especially TrimProt CG XIII 35,11-24; 36,22-6; 38,7-16; 40,29-41,1; 41,20-42,2; 45,21-7; 47,11-35; 49,6-32.

46. Cf. TrimProt CG XIII 39, 13-40, 19.
47. Art.cit., pp.412f. On the Holy Spirit in Gnosticism in general and in the Apocryphon in particular see R.McL. Wilson, "The Spirit in Gnostic Literature", in Christ and the Spirit in the New Testament (ed. B. Lindars and S. Smalley in honour of C.F.D. Moule), Cambridge 1973, pp.345-55.
48. Ibid. Cf. the interpretations of Pro- and Epi- metheus in Zos. On the Letter Omega, § 13 (Scott-Ferguson, Hermetica IV, p.107. 16-24).
49. If such a reading was present in the original one could understand its omission in BG 36, 16f. and CG III 14, 10 on the principle lectio difficilior potior.
50. Although there are lacunae in the short recension at this point (BG 54, 1; CG III 25, 21) they do not materially affect the sense.
51. CG II 23, 16-20 is a case of dittography and the following sentence (20ff.) abruptly and without any justification in the text introduces our sister, Sophia, and her guileless descent to correct her deficiency. CG IV 36, 10f. has the consort leave father and mother, and then the abrupt introduction of Sophia. See n.44.
52. Cf. CG II 10, 17f. and parr.
53. CG II 20, 17-19.
54. Cf. BG 71, 8ff.; CG III 36, 22; CG II 28, 1f.; CG IV 43, 12f. It may be that either the redactor's failure to grasp that the Epinoia is Sophia's consort, or his denial that the consort has already descended to Sophia (so that she herself is responsible for perfecting her deficiency, and his descent is still therefore in the future), has led to his confused rendering. See n.44.
55. On one occasion, and that only in the short recension, Sophia's consort is identified as the male virginal Spirit (BG 37, 4f.; CG III 14, 21-3). This figure may well originally represent Barbelo herself who is described in the short recension as becoming a first man, namely the virginal Spirit, the triple male (BG 27, 19-21; CG III 7, 23-8, 1). The parallel in CG II 5, 7f. and CG IV 7, 22f. has "holy Spirit", which, as we have

- seen, is applied both to Barbelo (as here) and to the Epinoia. There is some evidence that in the Gospel of the Egyptians the second highest figure in the presentations of praise is the male virgin Barbelo. Cf. CG III 42, 12f. = CG IV 52, 4f.; IV 54, 19f.; 61, 27; CG III 61, 25-62, 1 = CG IV 73, 11f. See Böhlig-Wisse, The Gospel of the Egyptians, p. 40. Cf. also 3 St Seth CG VII 121, 20-22.
56. Cf. e.g. Iren. adv. haer. I 30, 12 (Harvey I 238).
57. BG 51, 1-7; CG III 23, 19-24, 1. The reading of CG III 23, 31 "in a πρῶνικος" is more likely to be original given the contrast with her present repentant guileless state. The ἡ οὐ μὴντατκακία of BG 51, 4f. is an antithesis to the ἡ οὐ πρῶνικος of CG III 23, 21. Cf. the use of πρῶνικος and πρῶνικος in the Valentinian doctrinal letter in Epiph. Pan. XXXI 5, 7-9 (Hall 1, 392.2, 8, 13) to explain the origin of the aeons of the Pleroma. See above pp. 142f.
58. CG II 19, 15-18; CG IV 30, 1-3.
59. Cf. BG 37, 11; CG III 15, 3 (which has the false reading φρῶνικόν) and CG II 10, 1. The latter has Sophia produce out of her invincible power, but this is evidently a correction of the more original πρῶνικος of BG since the continuation: "her thought was not inactive and she revealed an incomplete work" does not suggest invincible power! Cf. Sophia's title and role as Prunicus in Iren. adv. haer. I 29, 4 (Harvey I 225) and I 30, 3 (Harvey I 228f.) and the guileless Sophia from whom Ialdabaoth snatched power in TrimProt CG XIII 39, 26-32.
60. See p. 142 of his edition of BG.
61. Apocryphon, p. 255.
62. CG III 11, 16; 12, 19. 21. 25. The redactor of CG II also makes use of the abbreviation, cf. CG II 7, 32; 8, 24.
63. Ibid., p. 143, on 51, 7.
64. Cf. Till, Koptische Grammatik § 200, p. 96.
65. S. Arai, NTS 15 (1968/69), pp. 305f., argues that the Autogenes of BG 51, 10 is an addition to the original four lights of CG III 24, 2f. which CG II and CG IV have emended to five lights to avoid inconsistency, but he fails to see the significance (1) of

- the "five lights" of CG III 23,23-24,1; (2) of the Coptic possessive prefix in CG III 24,2, "with his four lights", which clearly presumes a missing subject. The lights, moreover, are always closely associated with the Autogenes in the Nag Hammadi texts. Cf. G Egypt CG III 62,24ff.; Zostr CG VIII 127,15-128,7; TrimProt CG XIII 38,16-39,13.
66. CG III 24,3f.; cf. BG 51,10-12 ( π ε ς μ ο τ ρ ).
  67. CG II 19,20; CG IV 30,2f.
  68. Cf. BG 53,4f. and parr.
  69. Apocryphon, p.255. Cf. TrimProt CG XIII 49,6-20, esp.15f., where the Protennoia appeared to the archons and angels in their likeness ( ε ( ι ) Ν ε ). Arai, art.cit., pp.306 f., also argues that τ υ π ο ς is more original on the basis of Giversen's observation and his own point that the angelic form of the lights is accepted by the Demiurge.
  70. BG 51,12-52,11; CG III 24,4-20; CG II 19,21-20,5; CG IV 30,3-25.
  71. Thus the Demiurge is advised to breathe into Adam's face (the 20 of BG 51,15 and parr. = the π ρ ε ς ω π ο ν of Gen. 2:7 LXX).
  72. Cf. e.g. Iren. adv.haer. I 5,5 (Harvey I 49); V 12,2 (Harvey II 350-2); Tert. adv.Marc. II 9f.; de anima 11,1-3; ApocAd CG V 66,21-3; Baruch of Justin in Hipp.Ref. V 26,8 (Wendland 128.1-3).
  73. CG II 19,27f.
  74. CG II 19,28-32.
  75. Cf. the related concept in Saturninus (Iren. adv.haer. I 24,1: Harvey I 197): the supreme power sent the spark of life into the wriggling Golem, taking pity on him because he was made in its image.
  76. Iren.adv.haer. I 30,6 (Harvey I 233).
  77. Iren. adv.haer. I 5,5-6 (Harvey I 49-51); cf. Exc.ex Theod. 50,2-3 (Sagnard 162-4) where the reading of Gen.2:7 LXX, π ν ο υ ζ ω ν is retained; 53,2-5 (Sagnard 168).

78. Cf. BG 67,1-14; CG III 34,3-15. The long recension (CG II 26,10-19; CG IV 40,25-41,6) is plainly confused at this point.
79. Iren.adv.haer. I 30,6f. (Harvey I 233); 30,8 (Harvey I 234f.).
80. 30,9 (Harvey I 235); 30,14 (Harvey I 240).
81. See n.77.
82. Fragment 1 in Clem.Alex. Strom. II 8,36,2 (Stählin 2,132.8-10). It is, of course, not clear whether Valentinus envisaged the deposition of this seed as taking place via the Demiurge. Some Valentinians appear to have understood the Demiurge's inbreathing of at least the psychic element by the mediation of angels; cf. Exc.ex Theod. 50,2 (Sagnard 162ff.). According to Exc.ex Theod. 53,2 (Sagnard 168), the spiritual seed is sown in the soul by Sophia "ordained through angels by the hand of a mediator (a reference to Gal.3:19)". But that these angels appear to be the heavenly male consorts of the spiritual seed rather than the psychic angels of the Demiurge is suggested by the continuation; the seeds are ministered to by the male angels (53,3: Sagnard 168). On the role of the angels of the dispensation (ie. the psychic angels of the Demiurge?) in saving and tending the spiritual seed cf. Heracleon fragment 36 on John 4: 38 in Orig. Comm. in Joh. XIII 50.
83. Cf. Exc.ex Theod. 50,2 (Sagnard 162ff.); 53,2 (Sagnard 168); Heracleon frag. 36 on John 4:38 in Orig. Comm. in Joh. XIII 50.
84. Cf. Exc.ex Theod. 53,3f. (Sagnard 168); Heracleon frag. 35 on John 4:37 in Orig. Comm. in Joh. XIII 49. In the former passage, just as the Demiurge is ignorant of Sophia's role in all he does, so are men (of the activity of the male angels. Cf. Exc.ex Theod. 35,2-4: Sagnard 136-8, etc.).
85. Adv.haer. I 30,6 (Harvey I 233).
86. Schottroff's argument that each episode represents a complete act of salvation and that hence one should not interpret the narrative as a Heilsgeschichte but only as a variety of ways of describing the existential situation of the Gnostic (Der Glaubende, pp.10,68) does not appear to take this into account. As Rudolph suggests (ThR 36 (1971), p.29), she may be too influenced by Johannine lines of interpretation (i.e. the Bultmannian interpretation of John!).



87. Art.cit., p.411.
88. But we should note the redemptive and revelatory aspects and functions of these heavenly light-beings in our texts. Thus in G Egypt CG III 62,24ff. Seth is sent to redeem his seed by the four lights by the will of the Autogenes. Again according to the Barbelognostics of Iren. adv.haer. I 29,2 (Harvey I 223), Armoges, the first great luminary, has Charis (grace) attached to him and is called "Soter", suggesting that he may have had a soteriological role in their (missing) views of redemption. The fourth light, Eleleth, appears to be responsible for the manifestation of Sophia in TrimProt CG XIII 39,13-32 (cf. G Egypt CG III 56,22-57,1; AJ BG 34,2-7 and parr.) and for the blessing conveyed on her by the Pleroma (TrimProt CG XIII 39,32-40,4), and in NatArch CG II 94,2-97,21 he is responsible for revealing to Norea, the daughter of Eve, the saving knowledge of the true nature of the hostile archons and of her own spiritual origin. Cf. also the description of the four lights in Zostr CG VIII 29,1-20.
89. BG 49,6-9; CG III 22,15-18; CG II 15,3-5.11-13; CG IV 23,16-20.29-24,1.
90. BG 52,8-11; CG III 24,17-20 (6 M 60M); CG II 20,3-5; CG IV 30,22-5.
91. BG 52,14f.; CG III 24,22f.; CG II 20,6.
92. BG 52,3-8; CG III 24,15-17.
93. CG II 20,1-3; CG IV 30,20-2. This recalls the Jewish mythologumenon of the jealousy of the first angel and his cohorts towards Adam and their refusal to obey God's command to worship him, as a consequence of which they were thrown down. Cf. Vit. Adae xii-xvi; Schatzhöhle (tr. Bezold 1883) p.4; Cyprian, de zel.et livore, 4 (CSEL III,i Hartel 421,8ff.); Augustine de Gen.ad.lit., XI,2,14 (CSEL XXVIII,346.12ff.). In OnOrWld CG II 104,13-15 all the powers of chaos were jealous of Sabaoth because of his light. On the theme of envy in the Paradise account and its utilisation in Gnostic and other literature cf. W.C. van Unnik, "Der Neid in der Paradiesgeschichte nach einigen gnostischen Texten" in Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts in honour of Alexander Böhlig (Nag Hammadi Studies vol.III) Leiden 1972, pp.120-32; B.A.Pearson, "Jewish Haggadic Traditions in the Testimony of Truth from Nag Hammadi (CG XI,3) "in Ex Orbe Religionum (Supplements to Numen XXI), Leiden 1972, pp.457-70.

94. BG 52,12-15 and CG III 24,20-23 derive the first from the second. CG II 20,6f. and CG IV 30,26-31,1, in that they repeat that the man shone rather than that he entered his light, may be preferable. On the ideas of light-man and his innocence, cf. Zos., On the Letter Omega, § 12 (Scott-Ferguson, Hermetica IV p.107.11-14).
95. BG 52,15-17; CG III 24,23f.; CG II 20,7-9; CG IV 31,1-3.
96. Apocryphon, p.257.
97. BG 52,17-53,10; CG III 24,25-25,11; CG II 20,9-19; CG IV 31,3-7. The long recension may have omitted the last idea since it recurs at BG 55,13 = CG III 26,25-27,1; CG II 21,13..
98. BG 53,10-17; CG III 25,12-17; CG II 20,19-24.
99. CG III 25,14; CG II 20,21. This, in the light of the mention of deficiency (BG 53,16; CG III 20,16), seems better than the "perfect temple" of BG 53,13f.
100. This is the rendering of the short recension which appears to make more sense than the long, which speaks of enlightening him (since  $\kappa\tau\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\varsigma$  is feminine and the text consistently uses masculine suffixes, Adam must be the subject or rather object) about his descent to the seed (  $\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\alpha$  - perhaps a misreading of  $\upsilon\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\eta\mu\alpha$  ?), the way of ascent, the way he came down.
101. BG 53,18-54,4; CG III 25,17-23; CG II 20,24-8. The plural form "deficiencies" in the short recension might be taken to refer to Sophia's offspring.
102. Janssens would interpret this episode as a simple recollection of BG 52,8ff. and parr. (art.cit., p.413), but, as we saw, BG omits the original mention of man becoming powerful and entering his light. The reason for that might be the presence of this doublet, but in any case the context suggests that the shadow of light is more due to the secret presence of the Epinoia than to that of the power of the Mother. But the reduplication is worth noticing since it suggests that the Apocryphon is attempting to introduce and justify a further stage or element in man's history or make-up, viz. his material body.



103. BG 54, 5-8; CG III 25,23-26,3; CG II 20,28-31; CG IV 32,1-5. The short recension's verb  $\overline{\text{P}}\text{OY}\text{O}\text{EIN}$  is perhaps preferable to the  $\text{OY}\text{O}\text{N}\text{Z}$  of the long. Confusion is possible between the two in Coptic. For a similar idea cf. the Ophite view in Iren. adv. haer. I 30,6 (Harvey I 233): the man got Nous and Enthymesis, thanked First Man and abandoned his creators. Cf. also ApocAd CG V 64,14-19.
104. The short recension appears to have confused the original  $\epsilon\iota\omega\rho\mu$ , meaning "stare, look intently" (Crum, Dictionary 84b) with  $\chi\omega\rho\mu$ , "make a sign, nod agreement" (Crum, Dictionary 785b), which has a Sahidic form  $\epsilon\iota\omega\rho\mu$  (so Crum, ibid.). The two verbs are frequently confused. See Kasser, Compléments au dictionnaire coptique de Crum, Cairo 1964, p.109. The short has thus used the (wrong) loan word  $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha(\nu\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\gamma$  to translate the Coptic its copyists must have found in their Vorlagen. CG III 26,4 appears to have felt compelled to add the whole archonship of the powers as the subject, in order to make sense of the verb.
105. BG 54,14-55,3; CG III 26,8-14; CG II 20,35-21,5. The short recension enumerates flame ( $\kappa\rho\omega\mu$ ) as a fourth element, and the mixture with the winds so that they blow fierily as a separate event. Since CG II 20,35-21,2 uses the same word ( $\zeta\alpha\tau\epsilon$ ) for fire and the fiery winds, this may suggest an attempt to correct the short recension by omitting the fourth element and telescoping events. Giversen, Apocryphon, p.258, points out that the four elements correspond in striking fashion with the fount of the demons in CG II 18,2-6; heat, cold, dampness, dryness. The latter may correspond to the hot dry air which flame ( $\kappa\rho\omega\mu$ ) may represent. Here we pass from the psychic demons and their composition to the creation of material, perishable elements, the realm of death.
106. BG 55,3-9; CG III 26,14-19; CG II 21,5-9. The different order of elements is worth noting; they now correspond to the more usual order, from heaviest to lightest. The identification of matter with the darkness of ignorance in CG II 21,7f. is probably secondary and the text may originally have read: "matter, which is ignorance, and darkness and ....".  $\overline{\text{M}}\text{N}\overline{\text{T}}\text{K}\Delta\text{K}\epsilon$  has been read as  $\overline{\text{M}}\text{N}\text{K}\Delta\text{K}\epsilon$ . The  $\epsilon\tau\omega\beta\sigma\iota\delta\epsilon\iota\tau$  of CG II 21,9 cannot mean "opposed spirit" as Krause translates it on p.166 of his edition, but something like "varying ( $\pi\omicron\iota\kappa\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ ) spirit". See A. Böhlig, "Zum Antimimon Pneuma in den koptischen gnostischen Texten" in

Mysterion und Wahrheit, pp.162-74. Janssens, art.cit., p.414, argues persuasively for the retention of the form ἀντικείμενον πνεῦμα of BG 55,8 on the ground that it is the antithesis of the good spirit. On the question of the origin of the odd form in CG II (ετυββιδεϊτ) we might note that in Pistis Sophia Book III, ch.131 (Schmidt-MacDermot NHS IX p.332f.) Christ speaks of the soul drinking a cup of forgetfulness from the seed of evil, filled with every various (ετυοσε) desire (ἐπιθυμία) and forgetfulness (βυε). This cup becomes the body of the soul and like the soul in every form, and this is called the ἀντίμυμον πνεῦμα. From the fact that it is full of various (ετυοσε) desires, it could readily be called ετυββιδεϊτ.

107. BG 55,9-13; CG III 26,20-23; CG II 21,9-12. The mention of the robbers in CG III 26,22f.; CG II 21,11 and CG IV 32,25f. is a characteristic Gnostic motif and may be original. Cf. e.g. GPh CG II 53,11f.; Ex Soul CG II 127,27; SJC BG 94,18; 104,12; 121,3.16. The term "fetter of oblivion (λήθη ? CG III 26,23; βυε CG II 21,12)" is slightly preferable to the "fetter of matter (ύλη)" of BG 55,12f., despite Till's note on p.302 of his edition. Cf. SJC BG 103,17; CG III 107,5f. It is man's whole situation, subject to ignorance, passion, mortality etc., not just his materiality which is summed up as his fetter. But confusion between the two terms is understandable.
108. BG 55,13-15; CG III 26,23-27,1; CG II 21,12-14; CG IV 32,26f. The first point is omitted by BG but found in CG III 26,23-5; CG II 21,12f.; CG IV 32,26f., and although perhaps implicit, may be original. Death and mortality form a further qualification of human existence. The second point occurs for the first time here in CG II 21,13f. but may have been omitted on the previous occasion to tidy up the text. The third idea may well refer to the fact of Man's dual nature; heavenly power or soul on the one hand, fetter or tomb of the body on the other. See Till's note on p.151 of his edition. Schenke, "Die neutestamentliche Christologie", p.216, sees in the references here and at BG 53,6f. and parr. to Adam descending the traces of the concept of Adam, the Primal Man, descending to save his children or members, but this is surely to confuse heavenly Adamas and Seth with their earthly counterparts.
109. CG II 21,14-16; CG IV 33,1. This despite the earlier assertion that she is already concealed in him. Cf. CG II 20,25.

110. BG 55,15-18; CG III 27,2-4. As Till suggests on p.150 of his edition, the  $\pi\rho\omicron\tau\omicron\varsigma$  of BG 55,16 may be a misunderstanding of the original  $\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$  underlying CG III 27,2.
111. Cf. BG 27, 5-19; CG III 7,12-23.
112. Art.cit., p.413.
113. BG 55,18-57,19; CG III 27,4-28,16; CG II 21,16-22,9; CG IV 33,1-34,9.
114. Neither Swete nor Rahlfs read  $\tau\eta\varsigma \tau\rho\upsilon\phi\eta\varsigma$  at Gen.2:15 in their editions of the LXX. However the Göttingen edition has it in its apparatus referring to Jerome Heb. quæst. in lib. Gen. 2,15 (CC LXXII,4). The phrase does of course occur in Gen.3:23f. LXX and Sahidic.
115. CG II 21,16-19; CG IV 33,1-5. In NatArch CG II 88,24-32 it is the archons who put Adam in the garden and command him to eat. But its author is much more faithful to the text of Genesis. Cf. OnOrWld CG II 115,27-9.
116. BG 56,1-6; CG III 27,6-11 (  $\tau\rho\omicron\phi\eta$  is clearly a mistake for  $\tau\rho\upsilon\phi\eta$  ); CG II 21,19-21; CG IV 33,5-7.
117. BG 56,3-10; CG III 27,9-14; CG II 21,19-24; CG IV 33,5-11.
118. A summary of a very confused passage, BG 56,10-57,7; CG III 27,14-28,6; CG II 21,24-22,2; CG IV 33,11-34,4. The short recension makes slightly more sense over the branches and leaves where CG II 21,30-3 = CG IV 33,19-23 seems more confused in its mention of "rest" and "shadow". The long recension simply mentions the image of the archons' spirit (CG II 21,29 = CG IV 33,17f.), while the short has the counterfeit spirit (BG 56,14f.) attempting to turn man from recognising his perfection. This again may reflect attempts by the long to remove inconsistencies; we do not hear of the creation of the counterfeit spirit proper till after the Flood (BG 74,6ff. and parr.). However, the spirit here may simply be the evil spirit in man, part of his material nature.
119. BG 57,8-19; CG III 28,6-16. Cf. CG II 22,3-9; CG IV 34,5-9. Here we have a typical Gnostic interpretation of Gen. 3:7.

120. Janssens, art.cit., pp.415f., argues in similar fashion, but on the basis of BG, that the Epinoia is no more to be identified with the tree of knowledge than the counterfeit spirit is with the tree of life. Further, the Epinoia in BG 60,16ff. teaches Adam by means of the tree. As the counterfeit spirit promises to give life by means of the tree of life (but it is not real life!) so the Epinoia really does give knowledge by means of the tree of knowledge.
121. BG 57,20-58,7; CG III 28,16-23; CG II 33,9-15; CG IV 34,14-20. Does the snake perhaps here represent the Devil and thus correspond to the serpentine son of Ialdabaoth of the Ophites of Iren. adv.haer. I 30,5 (Harvey I 232) and 30,8 (Harvey I 234f.)?
122. So Janssens, art.cit., p.417. That the role of the snake may be an integral part is suggested by the virtual recapitulation of his role in BG 63,2-6; CG III 31,23f.; CG II 24,28, attributed to the chief archon, of whom, as Janssens points out (ibid., pp.417f.), the snake is a manifestation.
123. BG 60,16-61,4; CG III 30,14-19.
124. CG II 23,24-35; CG IV 36,17-37,4.
125. BG 57,20 ( δ' ἵτα ζωὴν ἐπατοῦν ); CG III 28,16 ( ἀεὶ ταῦτα [οὐ μόνον ἐ]πατῶν ); CG II 22,9 ( ἀϊκεῶσιν ). Cf. BG 64,6-10; 76,1-5; CG III 32,16-20 ( ταῦτο ἐπατῶν ); CG II 25,11-14; 31,12-14 ( κεῖτο ἐπατῶν; ὡς ).
126. Cf. BG 60, 19-61,4; CG III 30,16-19 ( ταῦτο; τοῦ νοῦ ἐπατῶν ); CG II 20,21.23 etc. However the distinction is not hard and fast: ταῦτο ἐπατῶν is used of the activity of the Epinoia in BG 53,12f., and ὡς is the parallel in CG II 20,20f.
127. Art.cit., p.416.
128. However there are traces of a similar idea of man's original superior state and subsequent fall into mortality and ignorance in e.g. the Ophite system of Iren. adv.haer. I 30,9 (Harvey I 235), where it is associated with man's expulsion from Paradise, and ApocAd CG V 64,14-65,25 where after Adam and Eve are separated by the Creator they lose their original glory and knowledge and become mortal and enslaved by their creator.

Cf. also Zos. On the Letter Omega § 12 (Scott-Ferguson Hermetica IV, p.107.11ff.) where heavenly light-man is persuaded to put on the Adam of the four letters, the product of Heimarmene, and is thus enslaved to it.

129. GPh CG II 71, 22-72,4 relates the two trees to animal-like and man-like existence while 73,27-74,12 appears to contrast the tree of knowledge in the garden which killed Adam, i.e. the Law, with the knowledge which the true Gnostic eats, which makes him alive. The Baruch of Justin (Hipp. Ref. V 26,6: Wendland 127.21-5) exactly reverses the Apocryphon: the tree of life is the Father's good angel, Baruch, the tree of knowledge is Eden's evil angel, Naas. NatArch CG II 88,24-89,3; 89,31-90,19 only mentions the tree of knowledge which, when eaten, does allow Adam and Eve to recognise their nakedness of the spiritual element. OnOrWld CG II 116,25-32; 118,10-119,19 also concentrates on the tree of knowledge, but it is closer to the Apocryphon in that it has Zoe/Eve, the spiritual woman, enter the tree and become tree, and the Instructor, its interpretation of the snake, come and persuade Adam and Eve to eat.
130. Cf. the role of the serpentine son of Ialdabaoth, the Nous, produced from the dregs of matter, who is the origin of (evil?) spirit, of oblivion, wickedness, jealousy, envy and death in Iren. adv.haer. I 30,5 (Harvey I 232). The doctrine of the two spirits may well originate from Jewish sectarian ideas such as those of the Qumran scrolls. Cf. W.-D. Hauschild, Gottes Geist und der Mensch, Munich 1972, pp.255f.
131. BG 58,8ff.; CG III 28,23ff.; CG II 22,15ff.; CG IV 34,20ff.
132. CG II 22,16-18.
133. BG 59,6-7; CG III 29,12f.; CG II 22,28f.; CG IV 35,8f.
134. BG 58,10-12; CG III 28,25-29,1; CG II 22,18-20.
135. BG 59,12f.; CG III 29,18f.
136. CG II 22,32-23,2; CG IV 35,14-22.
137. Adv.haer. I 30,7 (Harvey I 233).



138. Cf. NatArch CG II 89,17-30; OnOrWld CG II 116,8-117,15. A trace of this motif is also found in the Ophite system right after the production of Eve. Cf. Iren. adv.haer. I 30,7 (Harvey I 233f.). The same theme is found later in the Apocryphon, cf. BG 62, 3ff. and parr.
139. Cf. adv.haer. I 30,6-7 (Harvey I 232f.). However the figure and activity of the Sophia of the Ophites of Irenaeus has much in common with that of the Epinoia of the Apocryphon.
140. Cf. Iren. adv.haer. I 30,6 (Harvey I 233) where man, through the inbreathing of Ialdabaoth, receives Nous and Enthymesis, which are the elements which are saved. Thus Man thanks First Man and abandons his creators (perhaps for the light as in BG 54,14f.?). Crum, Dictionary 200a, does not give  $\nu\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$  or  $\epsilon\nu\theta\upsilon\mu\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  as Greek originals translated by  $\mu\epsilon\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$ , but does have cognates of  $\nu\epsilon\upsilon\varsigma$ , like  $\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\mu$ ,  $\epsilon\nu\nu\omicron\iota\gamma$ ,  $\delta\iota\alpha\nu\omicron\iota\gamma$ , etc.
141. Cf. BG 58,10-12 and parr.; 59,7-9 and parr.; 59,12f. and parr. In the last case CG II omits any reference to a decision, perhaps out of awareness of the awkward repetition.
142. BG 59,7-9; CG III 29,13-15; CG II 22,29f.; CG IV 35,9-11.
143. BG 59,12-19; CG III 29,18-24.
144. CG II 22,28-23,5; CG IV 35,8-25. The Epinoia was supposed to have appeared to him (CG II 22,35f.), but there is no indication of this in our texts.
145. BG 58,12f.; CG III 29,1f.; CG II 22,20f.; CG IV 34,27f.
146. Cf. BG 59,20f.; CG III 30,1f. The long recension, perhaps aware of the inconsistency, puts this episode after the Epinoia removes the veil, as the consequence of her action, CG II 23,5-8; CG IV 35,26-31.
147. CG II 89, 3-31.
148. CG II 115,31-117,15.
149. CG II 89,3-15.

150. CG II 89,17-31.
151. OnOrWld CG II 115,31-116,25.
152. CG II 116,25-117,15.
153. Cf. BG 60,3f.: Adam recognised his own  $\epsilon\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$ . Here CG III 30,3f. (Adam recognised his  $\epsilon\theta\epsilon\iota\alpha$  which is like (  $\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon$  ) him) appears to be a compromise between BG and CG II 23,9 (he recognised his image (  $\epsilon\iota\mu\epsilon$  )).
154. Cf. NatArch CG II 89,13; OnOrWld CG II 116,6. CG II 23,4 with its incomprehensible "and he saw the woman before him", which makes no sense when applied to Ialdabaoth, may well preserve this idea, which the short recension with its tendentious sentence (BG 59,19: "he created the woman before him"; CG III 29,23f.: "he created a woman and set her before him") appears to have misunderstood and attempted to emend.
155. A Sahidic version of Gen. 2:21 reads  $\beta\omega\epsilon$  as Bullard notes, Hypostasis, p.74. CG III 29,3 preserves the  $\epsilon\kappa\sigma\tau\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$  of Gen. 2:21 LXX.
156. BG 58,14ff.; CG III 29,2ff.; CG II 22,21ff., CG IV 34,28ff. This represents the Gnostic interpretation of  $\psi\pi\psi\sigma\epsilon$ . The long recension's pedantic allusion to Moses' first book is obviously its own addition. One must presuppose the rendering in the short recension to make sense of the reference to "his senses" in CG II 22,25 and CG IV 35,3.
157. Is. 6:10 LXX in BG 59,1-6; CG III 29,8-12; CG II 22,21-8; CG IV 35,4-7. For the Coptic of this verse see R. Kasser, "Citations des grands prophètes bibliques dans les textes gnostiques coptes", in Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts in honour of Pahor Labib (ed. M. Krause; = Nag Hammadi Studies, vol.VI), Leiden 1975, p.59. The versions in the Apocryphon diverge considerably but may reflect the Matthean version of Is. 6:10, which in Coptic has the verb  $\alpha\gamma\epsilon\phi\omega$  (as in the  $\tau\eta\alpha\theta\bar{\rho}\omega\sigma$  of BG 59,3 and  $\tau\eta\alpha\gamma\phi\omega$  of CG II 22,26). The short recension reads "ears of their hearts" which the long may have omitted as being clumsy. In any case the verse is alluded to in a manner which bears out the Gnostic interpretation; the God of the Old Testament deliberately darkens men's senses.
158. BG 59, 7-12; CG III 29,13-17; CG II 22,29-32; CG IV 35,9ff.



159. BG 59,14-29; CG III 29,19-24; CG II 22,34-23,5.
160. Art.cit., pp.418f.
161. Pace Giversen, Apocryphon, p.263. If the Epinoia is unattainable, how was she caught and inserted into the woman? She continues to work in Adam.
162. Giversen, ibid., insists that the  $\epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$  of CG II 23,23 must refer to Adam's wife, despite the fact that the text clearly refers to Sophia and has dropped any reference to Adam giving the name. Further evidence to suggest that the title " $\Sigma\omega\phi\iota\alpha$ " belongs most appropriately to the Epinoia occurs in CG II 24, 13-15 = CG IV 37,23-6, where the Pronoia sends out assistants to remove Zoe from Eve. This recalls Sophia's removal of virtus from Eve when she is created in the Ophite system (Iren. adv.haer. I 30,7: Harvey I 233).
163. The theme of the original unity of man and the tragedy of his split, the healing of which is a major concern of salvation, is of course one very widespread in Gnosticism and found in Valentinianism in particular. Cf. e.g. Exc. ex Theod. 21; 36; 68; GPh CG II 64,31-65, 26; 68,22-6; 69,4ff.; 70,9-22; GTh CG II Logia 22; 114 etc.
164. The original version of the Apocryphon may have entirely omitted the snake, who plays such an important part in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic interpretation of Genesis. In its present Christian format perhaps the omission was felt to be awkward and it was therefore included by means of the disciple's question. But see n.122.
165. See above p.411.
166. Cf. BG 60, 16f.; CG III 30,14f.; CG II 23,24f.; CG IV 36,17f. On the term  $\alpha\upsilon\theta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\iota\alpha$  (BG 60,17; CG II 23,25) and its Coptic equivalent  $\pi\tilde{n}\tau\chi\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  (CG III 30,14f.) as referring to the heavenly world and as virtually the designation of a heavenly being cf. CG II 29,12f.; BG 73,13f. (  $\pi\tilde{n}\tau\chi\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  ); CG III 38,6 (  $\pi\tilde{n}\tau\chi\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$   $\pi\tilde{n}\tau\alpha$   $\nu\lambda\rho\epsilon$  ); NatArch CG II 94,24 (  $\pi\tilde{n}\tau\alpha$   $\nu\lambda\rho\epsilon$   $\pi\tilde{n}\tau\alpha\upsilon\theta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\iota\alpha$  ); Poimandres, CH I 2 (  $\epsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$   $\alpha\upsilon\theta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\iota\alpha\varsigma$   $\nu\theta\upsilon\varsigma$  ); Cerinthus in Hipp. Ref. VII 33,2 (Wendland 221.3); X 21,3 (Wendland 281.13), cf. Iren. adv.haer. I 26,1 (Harvey I 211: principalitas ); Saturninus in Hipp. Ref. VII 28 (Wendland 208.14), cf. Iren. adv.haer. I 24,1 (Harvey I 196:

summa potestas); Cainites in Theod. haer. fab. comp. I 15 = Iren. adv. haer. I 30, 14 (Harvey I 241: principalitas) etc. Janssens, art.cit., p.420, suggests that the figure of the Pronoia, who gives authority to the Epinoia, thus making the revelation (of knowledge) or manifestation (of the eagle) -  
 ΠΟΥΩΝ Ζ ΕΒΟΛ      in its two senses - possible, lies  
 behind      αὐθεντία      here.

167. On p.236 of his edition.
168. The ΝΑΥ of CG IV 36,19 must refer to Adam.
169. The lacuna at the beginning of CG IV 36,19, which Krause reconstructs [ΠΟΥΩΝ Ζ ΕΒΟΛ ...] could be read as [ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΟΤΕ ...], the eye of the scribe jumping to the [ΕΒΟΛ ΖΙΤΟ]ΤΕ of 36,20.
170. BG 60,18-61,2; CG III 30,26-28. It is perhaps better to link the knowledge with the Epinoia, as in BG, than with the revelation, as in CG III. On the theme of the eagle as a supernatural messenger and a possible representation of Christ see Janssens, art.cit., pp.419f. On the syncretistic background see G.W. MacRae, "Sleep and Awakening in Gnostic Texts", Le Origini, p.500. MacRae rightly points to the contrast between snake and eagle which may be implied here.
171. CG II 23,24-31; CG IV 36,17-29.
172. Note the similarities of expression and terminology in the three episodes: in CG II 22,9 we have the same emphatic "I" and the verb ΚΕΛΩ, and in CG II 31,12f. the Saviour says "it is I .... who raises you up (ΚΟΖΕ ΕΞΡΑΪ); in CG II 23,30f. the Saviour awakens (ΤΟΥΝΟΥΚ) Adam and Eve from deep sleep (ΖΙΝΗΣ), in CG II 31,5f. he calls the Gnostic to rise (ΤΩΟΥΝ ΕΒΟΛ) from his heavy sleep (ΖΙΝΗΣ), and in 31,22 the Saviour says he raised (ΤΟΥΝΟΥΚ) the Gnostic. In CG II 23,28f. the Epinoia is from the Pronoia of pure light, while in 31,11f. the Saviour identifies himself as the Pronoia of the pure light. Janssens' surmise (art.cit., p.420) that the αὐθεντία of the short recension conceals a reference to the Pronoia, although perhaps true, does not, however, explain exactly why the long recension added the term in CG II 23,24.

173. BG 60,18-61,5; CG III 30,16-20. Here again the long recension attempts to be more faithful to the Genesis account in referring to "them" rather than "him" (CG II 23,30 = CG IV 36,27). CG III 30,16ff. is unfortunately afflicted by lacunae. Krause's reconstruction has  $\epsilon\rho\omicron\gamma$  in l.16,  $\alpha\sigma\tau\omicron\gamma\nu\omicron\gamma\epsilon\iota\alpha[\tau\gamma\epsilon\beta\alpha\lambda]$  in l.18 and  $\epsilon[\zeta\epsilon\rho\pi\mu\epsilon]\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$  in l.19, which is followed by  $\overline{\mu}\pi\epsilon\gamma\pi\lambda\eta\rho\omega\mu\alpha$ , suggesting that the redactor was aware of the contradiction and attempted to remove it. BG 61,2-5, by having Adam alone as the object of instruction (by a female being), may reflect the tradition that Eve represents the spiritual woman who persuades Adam to eat.
174. BG 61,5-7 and CG III 30,20-2 ( $\pi\tau\epsilon\mu\alpha$ ); CG II 23,31-3 and CG IV 36,29-37,1 ( $\omicron\gamma\alpha\epsilon$ ).
175. CG II 23,33-5; CG IV 37,1-4.
176. Cf. CG II 21,14ff. and parr; 28,1-4 and parr.
177. "Sleep and Awakening", *Le Origini*, pp.496-507. However he admits in the ensuing discussion (ibid., p.507) that the ending of the long recension is secondary both in time and nature to the rest.
178. Ibid., p.499.
179. Ibid.
180. That is not to say that she does not awaken man elsewhere; as we have suggested, awakening man's thought is a characteristic of her activity, cf. n.175. The point is that there is little support in the short recension at this juncture for MacRae's argument.
181. BG 61,2-7; CG III 30,18-22; CG II 23,30-3; CG IV 36,27-37,1. This echoes the earlier passage about the Epinoia as the tree of knowledge, cf. BG 57,16-19; CG III 28,13-16; CG II 22,6-9. For a similar Gnostic interpretation, but involving a real eating of the tree cf. NatArch CG II 90,13-18; OnOrWld CG II 119,6-19.
182. BG 61,7-9; CG III 30,22f.; CG II 23,35f.; CG IV 37,4-6. The formula is also a repetition of Ialdabaoth's earlier reaction, cf. BG 58, 8-10; CG III 28,23-5; CG II 22,15-18; CG IV 34, 20-4. NatArch CG II 90,19-29 and OnOrWld CG II 119,19-120,3 remain much more faithful to Gen. 3:7-13, using the passage to cast further light on the ignorance of the archons.

183. Adv.haer. I 30,7 (Harvey I 234).
184. CG II 23,37; CG IV 37,6. Both versions read "his earth".
185. BG 61,9f. CG III 30,23f. appears to omit the object.
186. Adv.haer. I 30,8 (Harvey I 234).
187. See n. 166.
188. By "his earth", the long recension might also be referring to the earthly element in the composition of Adam's material body, and thus obliquely to Adam. Cf. BG 55,4 and parr. In OnOrWld CG II 120,7f. the archons, after cursing Eve and her offspring, curse Adam and the earth and everything else. Cf. NatArch CG II 92,29-93,7 where Adam and Eve are similarly under the curse.
189. CG II 23,37-24,4; CG IV 37,7-11.
190. BG 61,10-12; CG III 30,24f.
191. BG 61, 12-15; CG III 30,25-31,2; CG II 24,2-4; CG IV 37,9-11. BG and CG III add "of the height" to "holy counsel".
192. BG 62, 3-11; CG III 31,6-13; CG II 24,8-19; CG IV 37,17-38,3.
193. For a similar archontic attempt to subjugate the spiritual woman to Adam with reference to Gen. 3: 16, cf. OnOrWld CG II 116, 8-25. Lines 24 and 25 read  $\Sigma\epsilon\kappa\lambda\lambda\epsilon\ \epsilon\tau\epsilon\epsilon\zeta\iota\mu\epsilon\ \nu\alpha\pi\gamma\gamma\omega\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\epsilon\ \bar{\nu}\alpha\rho\alpha\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \epsilon\rho\omicron\varsigma$ . The similarity to CG II 24,1f. is worth noting. Could the redactors of the long recension have mistaken a conjunctive for an imperfect?
194. Apocryphon, p.264. Cf. BG 51,1-14 and parr. Giversen draws attention to the similarity of terminology.
195. Art.cit., pp.420f.
196. CG II 21,26-9 and parr.
197. BG 61,16f.; CG III 31,2; CG II 24,4; CG IV 37,11f. The  $\epsilon\delta\epsilon\omicron\gamma$  ("curse") of BG 61,16 is probably an error for the  $\epsilon\delta\epsilon\omega$  ("blame, rebuke") of CG III 24,2, readily understandable in the context.

198. CG III 31,2-4. BG 61,17-19 connects the angels with the expulsion of Adam and Eve from Paradise. But in the light of Gen. 3:23 and the continuation in BG, Ialdabaoth surrounding them with darkness, he is the more appropriate subject. The long recension (CG II 24,4-7), which has Ialdabaoth independently revealing his ignorance to his angels, does not offer any explanation of how he does this, since his expulsion of Adam and Eve is not presented as such, but simply as a following independent event linked by the copula  $\lambda\gamma\omega$ .
199. BG 61,18-62,3; CG III 31,4-6; CG II 24,7f.; CG IV 37,15-17. In NatArch CG II 91,3-5 and OnOrWld CG II 121,4f., it is the archons who expel Adam and Eve from Paradise. Cf. ApocAd CG V 66,23-5 where, after Adam is wakened from the sleep of death and instructed by the three heavenly revealers, the Demiurge reproaches him for his sighing and then darkness comes over his and Eve's eyes. This may represent a Gnostic reinterpretation of the Jewish legend of the natural darkness which overtakes and terrifies Adam and Eve after their expulsion from Paradise and its continuous celestial light, cf. ARN 176; Gen. R XI,2; XII,6; Abodah Zarah 8b; Ginzberg, Legends vol. I, pp.86, 89; V, pp.112f., 116.
200. Adv. haer. I 30,7 (Harvey I 233f.).
201. Ibid., I 30,8 (Harvey I 234f.).
202. NatArch CG II 89, 17-31; OnOrWld CG II 116,8-117,15.
203. NatArch CG II 89, 21. Cf. Iren. adv. haer. I 30,7 (Harvey I 233: concupiscentes).
204. OnOrWld CG II 116,13-25.
205. Cf. his Scholia, Book XI (Pognon pp.133 and 196). See on this H.-C. Puech, "Fragments retrouvés de l'Apocalypse de l'Allogène", in Mélanges Franz Cumont (A JPh IV) II, Brussels 1936, pp.946 f. (= En quête de la Gnose I: La Gnose et le temps, Paris 1978, pp.280f.); Bullard, Hypostasis, p.84.
206. Cf. OnOrWld CG II 117,15ff.
207. Ibid.

208. "Le thème de la fornication des anges" in Le Origini, pp.488-94, esp. 490f.
209. Ibid., p.495.
210. Cf. Targum Ps. Jon. (TJ I) on Gen. 4:1; PRE 21; Ginzberg, Legends I, p.105; V, pp.133f.; the Archontics of Epiph. Pan XL 5,3 (Holl 2,85.19-22). In the Baruch of Justin in Hipp. Ref. V 26,22f. (Wendland 130.12-16), Naas, Eden's third angel, seduces both Eve and Adam and is thus responsible for both adultery and paederasty.
211. BG 62,3-8; CG III 31,6-9. Cf. the idea of the oblivion which surrounds Ialdabaoth in the Ophite account in Iren. adv. haer. I 30, 8 (Harvey I 234).
212. CG II 24,8-13; CG IV 37,17-23.
213. Cf. e.g. CG II 22,16-18 (= CG IV 34,20ff.) and CG II 23,33-5 (= CG IV 37,1-4) where the parallel passages in the short recension have no mention of the Epinoia.
214. CG II 24,13-15; CG IV 37,23-6.
215. Iren. adv. haer. I 30,8 (Harvey I 234f.). Cf. CG II 20,14-19; 23,24-6.37; 24,15ff.
216. BG 62,8-10; CG III 31,10-12; CG II 24,15-17; CG IV 37,27-9. Since the long recension's addition has the Pronoia as the immediate past subject it adds "the Protarchon" at CG II 24,16 = CG IV 37,27f. It also prefers the formula "two sons, the first and the second" (CG II 24,17 = CG IV 37,29f.) to the short recension's "the first son and similarly (ὁ ἑσόμενος) the second" (BG 62,8-10 = CG III 31,10-12).
217. CG II 24,18f.; CG IV 38,1-3. The fifth archon of Celsus' list had the πρόσωπον of a bear ( ἄρκτος ), and the fifth of Origen's diagram was Thauthabaoth, the ἄρκτοειδής (Orig. c. Cels. VI 30 (Koetschau 2,100.15-17)). In PS, Book III ch.126 (Schmidt-MacDermot 318.3f.17) the archon in the second location has the countenance ( ὄψις ) of a cat ( νεμὸν ) and the archon in the seventh that of a bear ( ἄρξ ).
218. BG 62,10f.; CG III 31,12f.



219. CG IV 38,3-6 (CG II 24,19f. has omitted the identification through homoeoteleuton); BG 62,12-15; CG III 31,13-16.
220. BG 62,15-18; CG III 31,16-19. Where BG 62,16f. has "he set him ( ἃϣΚἁἁϣἃ )" twice, CG III 31,16f. prefers the passive form "he was set" and has it once only. CG III 31,17 prefers ΚΡῶΜ ("flame"), a term confined to CG III (cf. 15,12; 16,5; 18,6.13; 26,10), to the Κωζῆρ of BG 62,16, and has "earth and water" at 31,18f. to the "water and earth" of BG 62,18f., CG II 24, 23f.; CG IV 38,9f. But in the earlier enumeration of the elements at CG III 26,16, the order is earth then water. The changes are probably stylistic. The earlier passage may explain why BG 62,16f. and CG III 31,18 read πνεῦμα where CG II 24,22 and CG IV 38,8 have ΠΝΥ. Cf. the Baruch of Justin in Hipp. Ref. V 26,7f. (Wendland 127.27 - 128.5), according to which Elohim is righteous and identified with heaven and spirit, while Eden is evil and is identified with earth and soul.
221. CG II 24,20-4; CG IV 38,6-10.
222. BG 62,18-62,2; CG III 31,19-21. CG III 31,20 omits the "men" of BG 62,20, perhaps feeling it to be redundant, and reads "Abel and Cain" at 31,20f. rather than the more usual "Cain and Abel" of Genesis and BG 63,1; CG II 24,25. This may again be a matter of style on the part of the redactors of CG III.
223. CG II 24,24-6. CG IV 38,10-14 is extremely fragmentary and appears to differ from CG II.
224. BG 63,9-12; CG III 32,3-6; CG II 24,32-4; CG IV 38,20-3. CG III 32,4 retains the passive form ἁγᾶπτοῦκἁθ᾽ ἰστᾶ it employed at 31,16f. As Giversen notes (Apocryphon, p.264), there is a distinct agreement between this passage and the earlier one (CG II 21,6f. and parr.) dealing with the creation of the material body. Eloim and Jave govern the graves of later generations because they govern the elements of which human bodies are composed.
225. Cf. Iren. adv.haer. I 30,9 (Harvey I 236); NatArch CG II 91,11-14. Giversen (ibid.) is clearly in error to say that Cain and Abel are Adam's sons.
226. Cf. BG 41,19-42,3; CG III 17,23 - 18,2; CG II 11,27-31; CG IV 18,18-20.



227. Cf. e.g. CG II 19,27f. (on Ialdabaoth's ignorance, omitted by the short recension); 22,34 - 23,2 = CG IV 35,16-22 (Ialdabaoth's creation of Eve in the image of the Epinoia (to trap her?), a motif missing in the short recension); 24,4f. (Ialdabaoth's own revelation of his ignorance to his angels rather than it being the work of Adam and Eve, as in the short recension).
228. Cf. BG 58,4-7 and parr. For the similarity of language see the following note.
229. BG 63,2-6 (  $\text{ΝΟΥΕΠΙΘΥΜΙΑ ΝΕΠΟΡΑ}$  ); CG III 31,21-32,1 (  $\text{ΝΟΥΕΠΟΡΑ ΝΕΠΙΘΥΜΙΑ}$  ); CG II 24,26-9 (  $\text{ΝΟΥΕΠΟΡΑ ΝΕΠΙΘΥΜΙΑ}$  ); CG IV 38,14? -16. The verb in BG 63,2, "began (  $\text{ἀρχώμεν}$  )", may have been corrected to "remained" in CG III 31,22 (  $\text{ἔω ἐρημην}$  ) and CG II 24,26 (  $\text{ἀέεω}$  ) because it was through the snake that sexual intercourse was initiated, according to BG 58,4-7 (  $\text{ἐπὶ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας}$  ); CG III 28,20-3 (  $\text{ἐπὶ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας}$  ); CG II 22,12-15 (  $\text{ἐπὶ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας}$  ); CG IV 34,16-20. CG II 24,27 has probably omitted the reference to marriage in BG 63,3 and CG III 31,22, perhaps because  $\text{συνουσία}$  was felt to express it. The form  $\text{τὰ ἀδάμ}$  "she who belonged to Adam", in CG II 24,29 is also a corrective on the part of the redactors of the long recension - Eve is made responsible!
230. BG 63,6-9; CG III 32,1-3; CG II 24,29-32; CG IV 38,16-20.
231. Cf. the Sahidic of Gen. 4:25 in C. Wessely, Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde, vol. XV (Griechische und koptische Texte theologischen Inhalts IV), Leipzig 1914, p.35, cited (inaccurately!) by Bullard, Hypostasis, p.93.
232. CG III 32,6f. has "he knew his own  $\text{ἐνθυμία}$ ". Could this have resulted from a misreading of an original Greek  $\text{τὴν οὐσίαν ἑαυτοῦ} \text{ (ΤΗΝ[ΘΥΛΙ]ΔΗΝΟΜΑΙΔΝΑΥΤΩΙ)}$ ?
233. Cf. BG 63,3 (  $\text{ΠΕΥΝΟΥΣΙΑ ΝΠΓΔΜΟC}$  ); CG III 31,21f. (  $\text{ΠΕΥ[ΝΟΥΣΙΑ ΝΠΓΔ]ΜΟC}$  ). On  $\text{συνουσία}$  as meaning consubstantiality, see Lampe, Patristic Lexicon s.v.  $\text{συνουσία}$ .
234. As Janssens rightly suggests (art.cit., p.421), it is the spirit of imitation who drives men to reproduce themselves through sexual generation as images of heavenly realities and, as such, inferior and subject to the power of the archons.

235. BG 63,12f. It is worth noting that the long recension, although apparently unaware of the ambivalent terms οὐραῖα and οὐρανία, lays even more stress on the heavenly nature of Seth; according to CG II 24,36-25,2 = CG IV 38,24-9, Adam, when he recognises the image of his own foreknowledge, begets the image of the Son of Man and calls him Seth, in accordance with the begetting of the heavenly Seth.
236. BG 63,18-64,1. CG III 32,10f. has: "to awaken those who are like him".
237. Thus the use of ὅτε plus conjunctive at CG III 32,1f. makes better grammatical sense and is repeated in 32,5f. Cf. BG 63,11f. The third person plural masculine possessive "their αὐτῶν" at BG 63,8f. makes no sense unless one presupposes the construction in CG III 32,1ff.
238. On righteousness etc. as a matter of convention imposed by the angelic world-creators, cf. the views of the Simonians in Iren. adv. haer. I 23,3 (Harvey I 193f.), and of Carpocrates, ibid., I 25,4 (Harvey I 207f.).
239. See n. 232.
240. BG 63,14ff.; CG III 32, 8ff. In SJC BG 88,8f. and 92,6f. γενεά refers to the heavenly, immoveable and kingless race.
241. Against the judgment of Giversen, Apocryphon, p.264, who has not seen the significance of ὁμοίως, although on p.265 he admits that the αὐτῶν of BG 63,14 "could allow the reader to believe that it introduces something new".
242. Cf BG 47,20-49,6 and parr.
243. Art.cit.,p.421. Cf. the role of the Protennoia in TrimProt CG XIII 45,29ff.: she cast the eternally holy spirit into her own, then reascended.
244. The term "the Mother", without qualification, always seems to apply to Sophia in the Apocryphon. Cf. BG 37,17 and parr.; 38,17 and parr.; 42,17f. and parr.; 43,2 and parr.; 44,19f. and parr.; 46,1.9 and parr.; 51,2.14.19 and parr., etc. In the case of BG 76,1, one should note that the parallel passage in CG III (39,19) has "this Mother", apparently referring back to the Father-Mother, the Barbelo, but this may be because the redactors of CG III, as here (32,9f.), refuse to admit that Sophia could have played a saving role.

245. Giversen, Apocryphon, p.265, argues against Till (p.166 of his edition) that the text in BG is not corrupt and that **ΝΔΕ** can be taken as an ethic dative, although he admits that CG III has a different tradition here.
246. Cf. BG 47,3ff. and parr.
247. This consubstantiality idea is clearer in BG 63,19-64,1, which in the original Greek may well have read  $\tau\eta\upsilon\ \sigma\theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \tau\eta\upsilon\ \theta\acute{\upsilon}\sigma\iota\delta\epsilon\ \alpha\beta\tau\omega$ , than in CG III 32,10f. But the latter's reading:  $\overline{\text{N}}\text{NE}+\text{INE}\ \text{MMOC}$ , may represent the Greek  $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \theta\mu\omicron\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \alpha\beta\tau\omega$ . In Wisd. 7:22 there is said to be a spirit in Wisdom (Sophia).
248. NTS 15 (1968/69), pp.308 n.3; 309 n.4.
249. Der Glaubende, pp.62-4.
250. See n.245.
251. Thus CG III 32,14-16 appears to have thought that it was Sophia who remained (if one fills the lacuna in l.14 [ $\lambda\epsilon\omega$ ], as Krause does on p.94 of his edition, and as the continuation demands:  $\epsilon\zeta\ \gamma\pi\omicron\gamma[\rho\epsilon\iota\ \dots]$ ) and worked on the seed. The long recension preserves the idea of the descent of the Spirit (CG II 25,3;  $\lambda\pi\iota\tau\overline{\text{N}}$  ; CG IV 38,30;  $\epsilon\pi\overline{\text{I}}\text{TN}?$  ).
252. CG II 25,2-9; CG IV 38,29-39,7.
253. Cf. the roles of Sophia preparing the emission from Ialdabaoth of Jesus as a pure vessel for the descent of the heavenly Christ in Iren. adv.haer. I 30,11-12 (Harvey I 238), of the Glory in ApocAd CG V 77,9-12, dwelling in houses it had prepared, and of Seth in G Egypt CG III 63,10-18 and par., preparing a logos-begotten body.
254. On the oblivion of the soul cf. Exc. ex Theod. 2,2 (Sagnard 56).
255. Untitled Text in the Bruce Codex, ch. 20 (Schmidt-MacDermot 262f.).
256. Apocryphon, p.265 with reference to Plato, Politicus X 621.
257. PS, Book III, ch.131 (Schmidt-MacDermot 332f.). See n.106. Giversen fails to note this parallel. Cf. AJ CG II 27,35 which qualifies the holy Spirit, the Epinoia, as  $\overline{\text{N}}\ \text{CMAT}\ \text{NIM}$ .

258. PS Book IV, ch. 144 (Schmidt-MacDermot 374). Cf. chs. 146 and 147. MacDermot in a footnote ad loc. suggests that Jalouham may represent Elohim. Elohim is, of course, one of the archons set over the body according to the Apocryphon.
259. BG 64,3-6. CG III 32,14-16 appears to understand Sophia as the subject, but this may derive from a misrepresentation of the Greek which would not have specified the gender of the subject. The previous subject (in CG III 32,12) is masculine and must have been the Spirit. On the Holy Spirit as limited to the saints cf. Orig. de Princ. I.3,5.
260. CG II 25,9-11; CG IV 39,7-9.
261. CG II 20,14-24; 27,34 - 28,4.
262. The introduction of the new interpretation of the Spirit's activity has meant the loss of continuity and lack of a subject. The fact that the previous subject was also neuter (the Spirit) could well have led a Greek redactor to interpret the neuter accusative τὸ σπέρμα (after a neuter participle ὑπάρχον?) as a nominative, and as the subject. He may also have been led to this interpretation as a way of avoiding confusion with the "Spirit from the holy aeons" in the following passage.
263. Art.cit., p.422.
264. BG 64,8f.; CG III 32,18f. BG 64,9 reads: "the deficiency ( ὤτα )"; CG III 32,19 "their deficiencies ( ὁστέρημα )". Cf. CG III 21,9.
265. BG 64,10-13; CG III 32,19-22. CG III 32,21 has πλήρωμα for the ἄωκ of BG 64,11, and CG III 32,22 has: "that they should now be free of deficiency ( ΝνεΥωωωτ )" for: "that there should not now be a deficiency in it (the aeon)" of BG 64,12f. Sophia is an aeon, according to BG 36,16f. and parr. Cf. Hipp. Ref. VI 31,7 (Wendland 159.17-20).
266. CG II 25,13-16; CG IV 39,12-15. Cf. Hipp. Ref. VI 31,6 (Wendland 159.15f.).
267. Cf. CG II 9,20; 14,3f. 6.8; 25,14f.; 30,16. On πλήρωμα in Valentinianism as referring to the world of the heavenly aeons cf. e.g. Iren. adv.haer. I 1,3 (Harvey I 11); 2,4-6 (Harvey I 19-23) etc. However, πλήρωμα can also apply to

- the syzygy of the Gnostic and his angelic counterpart, cf. Exc. ex Theod. 32,1 (Sagnard 128: Πλήρωμα and πλήρωμα); 33,1 (Sagnard 130), or to the individual heavenly aeons, cf. Iren. adv. haer. I 14,2 (Harvey I 132).
268. Cf. CG III 14,4; 21,7f.; 32,12.21 and parallels in BG (Σωκ).
269. Cf. e.g. BG 47,13f. and parr.; 54,2-4 and parr.; CG II 23,20-2; BG 76,1-5; CG III 39,19-21. However, this too recalls Valentinian ideas. Cf. Iren. adv. haer. I 5,6 (Harvey I 50f.).
270. BG 47,1-13; CG III 21,4-13; CG II 14,5-13; CG IV 22,5-15 (πνεῦμα; πλήρωμα; ταῦτο ἐρατ- / ὡς; ὡς). Cf. BG 60,12-14; CG III 30,11f. (ταῦτο ἐρατ-; ὑπερέρημα).
271. BG 53,4-17; CG III 25,6-17; CG II 20,14-24 (πνεῦμα; ῥῶσ / ὑποργεῖν; ταῦτο ἐρατ- / ὡς; Σωκ / πλήρωμα; ὡς / ὑπερέρημα; τοῦτος); BG 71,5-13; CG III 36,20-5; CG II 27,33-28,5 (πνεῦμα; (ὡς) ὡς; σπέρμα; τοῦτος).
272. BG 76,1-5; CG III 39,19-21 (ταῦτο ἐρατ-; σπέρμα / ὑπερέρημα). Cf. Exc. ex Theod. 35,2 (Sagnard 136).
273. Cf. adv. haer. I 30,6-12 (Harvey I 232-8). See Schenke, ZRGG 14 (1962), pp. 356-61.
274. Cf. adv. haer. I 30,12 (Harvey I 238).
275. See n. 269.
276. Der Glaubende, pp. 44ff.; 72ff., 79.
277. BG 47, 1-13 and parr.
278. Cf. TriTrac CG I 86,9-87,17; Exc. ex Theod. 23,1-2 (Sagnard 104-6); Iren. adv. haer. I 14,5 (Harvey I 138). See also Hipp. Ref. VI 32,2-5 (Wendland 160. 9-23).
279. On awakening and raising up (τοῦτος), cf. GTr CG I 30,14-23; on oblivion, cf. GTr CG I 17,24. 33. 36; 18,1.6. 8.11.18; 20,38; 21,36; TriTrac CG I 77,23; 98,3; on the seed, cf. e.g. Iren. adv. haer. I 5,6 (Harvey I 51); 6,4 (Harvey I 58); 7,1f. (Harvey I 58ff.) etc.; Exc. ex Theod. 1,1-3 (Sagnard 54);

- 2,1f. (Sagnard 54-6); 21,1f. (Sagnard 98); 26,1-3 (Sagnard 110-112) etc.; Heracleon frags. 16 and 36; Marcus in Iren. adv.haer. I 15,3 (Harvey I 150); Valentinus frag. 1 in Clem. Alex. Strom II 8,36,2 (Stählin 2,132.10); TriTrac CG I 95,24-31; GPh CG II 76,2; on raising up and correcting (  $\delta\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$  ;  $\epsilon\pi\alpha\nu\acute{o}\rho\theta\omega\sigma\iota\varsigma$  cf.  $\tau\delta\alpha\upsilon\epsilon\rho\alpha\tau$ - in Crum, Dictionary 456b, and  $\zeta\omicron\omicron\tau\epsilon$  , ibid., 380b), cf. Hipp. Ref. VI 32,4-5 (Wendland 160.20-3:  $\delta\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$  ;  $\delta\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$  ); Exc.ex Theod. 30,2 (Sagnard 124); 35,2 (Sagnard 136:  $\delta\iota\sigma\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$  of  $\sigma\pi\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$  ); Iren. adv.haer. I 13,1 (Harvey I 114); 14,5 (Harvey I 138); on deficiency and perfection, cf. e.g. Hipp. Ref. VI 31,5-6 (Wendland 159.6-16); GTr CG I 21,14-23; 24,25-33; 24,37-25,3; ~~35,35~~ 36,3; De Res CG I 48,38-49,6; TriTrac CG I 86,19-23; 87,1-4; 125,29ff.; 136,17-24. See Zandee, Numen XI (1964), pp.35-9; 41-3; 59-61.
280. Cf. e.g. Jonas, The Gnostic Religion, pp. 68-73; 80-90.
281. Cf. in CG II 25,14f. the addition of  $\bar{\nu}\eta\tau\lambda\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \bar{\nu}\eta\pi\omega\tau\alpha$  (cf. Crum, Dictionary 411b  $\bar{\nu}\eta\sigma\text{-}\theta\alpha\iota$ .), which recalls Iren. adv.haer. I 4,5 (Harvey I 39) = Exc.ex Theod. 45,1 (Sagnard 154):  $\bar{\nu}\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma\ \tau\omega\upsilon\ \pi\alpha\theta\omega\upsilon$  , and the reference to the Pleroma as the heavenly world.
282. BG 64,13-71,2; CG III 32,33-36,15; CG II 25,16-27,31; CG IV 39,16-43,6.
283. BG 71,2-5; CG III 36,15-17; CG II 27,31-3; CG IV 43,6-8.
284. BG 71, 7-14; CG III 36,20-37,1; CG II 27,34-28,5; CG IV 43,10-16. Cf. Puech, in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, I, p.326.
285. BG 71,5-75,10; CG III 36,17-39,11; CG II 27,33-30,11; CG IV 43,8-46,23.
286. BG 36, 2-15 and parr.
287. Cf. BG 42,15-43, and parr.; 48,17-50,4 and parr.; 51,1-52,8 and parr.
288. Cf. BG 65,3-6; CG III 33,4-6; CG II 25,23-5; CG IV 39,25-8. On the Spirit of life cf. ApocAd CG V 69,24f.: the Gnostics are saved from the Flood by great angels who take them into the place where the spirit of life is.



289. See n. 286. There may be a trace of this idea, however, in the mention of the pure light (BG 64,15f.; CG III 32,24f.; CG II 25,18; CG IV 39,18f.), and in the reference in the short recension to the souls becoming worthy of ascent to the great lights (BG 65,6-8. CG III 33,6f. simply reads: "worthy of the great lights"). Cf. BG 33,1f. and CG III 11,17 ("the four great lights").
290. Cf. BG 69,9-70,8; CG III 35,13-36,4; CG II 27,6-21; CG IV 42,4-23. However, this may be because it is only those souls who are ignorant who are reincarnated. BG 36,8f. and parr. concerns those souls who know their perfection.
291. Apocryphon, p.266. Cf. W.D. Hauschild, Gottes Geist und der Mensch, Munich 1972, pp.234f., who argues that this passage is based on a Jewish catechesis in terms of the two spirits such as that found in Qumran.
292. Ibid., p.267.
293. Ibid., p.268.
294. PS, Book I, chs. 22-3 (Schmidt-MacDermot 32.14-23).
295. Book III, chs. 111-12 (Schmidt-MacDermot 281-91); ch. 131 (ibid., 332-7). Cf. Böhlig, Mysterion und Wahrheit, pp.167-74.
296. Book IV, chs. 147-8 (ibid., 381.21-384.23).
297. Op.cit., pp.168f.
298. Ibid., pp.169-71. However, in BG 75,19-76,1; CG III 39,17f.; CG II 31,31f.; CG IV 49,12f., the Saviour calls the knowledge he has imparted "the mystery of the immoveable race".
299. Cf. SJC BG 117,12-118,7; 123,2-124, 9.
300. E.g. PetPhil CG VIII 134, 19 - 138,3; 1 ApocJas CG V 28,29-30,13.
301. Pace Giversen, Apocryphon, p.266. The SJC shows how such traditions could be tacked on to a non-Christian original, but it may also suggest how they could be devised ad hoc.
302. Loc.cit.



303. SJC BG 121,13- 127,2. For a similar example in an apparently non-Christian work, but one which betrays Christian influence, particularly in its eschatological conclusion, cf. NatArch CG II 96,15 - 97,21.
304. See notes 286 and 289.
305. CG III 32, 23-5 ( [εἰλι]κρινής ); CG II 25,17f.; CG IV 39, 17-19. BG 64 14-16 has "live more ( Νδω Ντ Ντογο )", which, as Till suggests in his apparatus ad loc., is due to a mistake in translation: Σώσονται. was read instead of σωσονται.
306. Cf. e.g. BG 22,23-23,1; CG IV 3,29; BG 26,18f.; CG III 7,5 ( εἰλικρινής ); BG 29,20; CG III 9,11f. ( εἰλικρινής ); CG II 6,11; CG IV 9,12f.; BG 30,8 ( εἰλικρινής ); CG III 9,19 ( εἰλικρινής ); CG II 6,18; CG IV 9,22f.
307. Cf. e.g. PS, Book I ch.19 (Schmidt-MacDermot 28.21ff.); SJC BG 106,10-19.
308. BG 64,16-65,3; CG III 32,25-33,4; CG II 25,18-23; CG IV 39,19-25.
309. In e.g. ThLZ 100 (1975) col.97. The "immoveable race" ( γενεά Νάτκιμ ) occurs in GEgypt CG III 51,8f. = CG IV 63, 2f.; CG III 59,13-15; 61,19f. = CG IV 73,3f.; 3 St Seth CG VII 118,12f. and possibly Zostr CG VIII 6,27. In SJC BG 88,8f. = CG III 97,9, "the immoveable race", as we have already indicated, would appear to designate purely heavenly beings.
310. Cf. BG 22,15; CG IV 3,20f.; CG III 36,24f. (BG 71,12f. omits "immoveable"); BG 73,9f.; CG III 38,2f.; CG II 29,10; CG IV 45,7; BG 75, 20-76,1; CG III 39, 8; CG II 31,31f.; CG IV 49,13.
311. In e.g. BG 22,15 and parr.; 65,2f. and parr.; 75,20ff. and parr.
312. In e.g. CG III 36,24f. where the other versions omit the term "immoveable", and in BG 73,9f. and parr. where a passage about the immoveable race is tacked on and does not quite fit the context: Noah covers himself with a place while the immoveable race enter a place and cover themselves with a cloud. Cf. ApocAd CG V 69,19-25.

313. IN GEgypt CG III 64,1-3 = CG IV 75,15-17, of course, Seth puts on Jesus, i.e. he is identified with the heavenly Christ as Saviour.
314. See n. 289.
315. See n.88. In the Hypostasis of the Archons, Eleleth is a revealer/redeemer, but there is no mention of heavenly Seth and the immoveable race.
316. CG II 25,26; CG IV 39,20 (  $\overline{\text{ZENMNTNOC}}$  ).
317.  $\overline{\text{Me}^{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\theta\alpha\varsigma}$ , of which  $\overline{\text{MNTNOC}}$  is the Coptic translation (cf. Crum, Dictionary 251a), is a technical term in Valentinianism meaning: (a) both an attribute and a title of the supreme being; cf. Iren. adv.haer. I 1,1 (Harvey I 9); 2,1 (Harvey I 13); 2,2 (Harvey I 15); 19,2 (Harvey I 176); 21,4 (Harvey I 186); GTr CG I 42,14; TriTrac CG I 52,26; 53,1; 54,20; 55,2.25.29; 56,11; 57,26 etc. (see index s.v.  $\overline{\text{NOC}}$ ,  $\overline{\text{MNTNOC}}$  ), and (b) angel; cf. Iren. adv.haer. I 13,3 (Harvey I 118); 13,6 (Harvey I 124f.); 14,5 (Harvey I 137). See on this Sagnard, La gnose valentinienne, index s.v.  $\overline{\text{Me}^{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\theta\alpha\varsigma}$ . However,  $\overline{\text{MNTNOC}}$  does also occur in non-Valentinian texts, e.g. Eug CG III 73,5 (= SJC BG 86,11f.; CG III 95,23f.); 77,17 (= SJC BG 95,13f.; CG III 102,5); 86,5f. (= SJC BG 109,16); 88,17 (= SJC BG 114,9; CG III 112,16f.). Interestingly enough, Eug 88,6ff. (= SJC BG 113,15ff.; CG III 112,7ff.) is an exact parallel of a passage in the Valentinian doctrinal letter preserved in Epiph. Pan. XXXI 5,4 (Holl 1,391,2-4). Whether the former or the latter was the borrower is, unfortunately, not entirely clear. Cf. also GEgypt CG III 54,19f. = CG IV 66,7f. (the latter differs from the former and has the plural form); OnOrWld CG II 103,30; NatArch, CG II 95,1; Iren adv.haer. I 29,1 (Harvey I 222).
318. BG 65,3f.; CG III 33,4f.; CG II 25,23f.; CG IV 39,25-7; BG 66,14-17; CG III 34,1-3; CG II 26,8-10; CG IV 40,21-3; BG 66,18-67,2; CG III 34,4f.; CG IV 40,25f. Janssens, art. cit., p.423, is surely right to suggest that the spirit of life is the holy Spirit, the Epinoia of light. The latter (as Janssens omits to point out) is also called "Zoe". Hauschild's contention (op.cit., p.255) that the background to this is the Jewish tradition of the two spirits as found in e.g. IQS iii.13 - iv.26, is no doubt correct. Cf. Test. Jud. 20. There may be a distant echo here of the descent of the Spirit on Christ at his baptism, cf. Matt.3:16; Mark 1:10; Luke 3:22; John 1:32f.; Acts 1:8.

319. BG 65,4f.; CG III 33,5; CG II 25,24; CG IV 39,27; BG 66,15f.; CG III 34,1-3; CG II 26,9f. CG IV 40,23f. Cf. the association of  $\delta\psi\chi\mu\iota\varsigma$  with the descent of the Holy Spirit in Acts 1:8. The reading of CG II 26,9:  $\tau\epsilon\omicron\omicron\mu\ \overline{\mu\pi\epsilon\tau\alpha\delta\alpha}$  over against BG 66,15f.; CG III 34,1-3; CG IV 40,23 which distinguish the two may be due either to an attempt to harmonise this with the earlier passage where the power appears to be already present, or to the influence of Acts 1:8.
320. BG 67,4-7; CG III 34,7-9; CG II 26,12-15; CG IV 40,29-32. Cf. BG 51,14 - 52,1 and parr. See also PS Book III, ch.131 (Schmidt-MacDermot 336.23f.); 132 (ibid., 340.18-21. 24- 341.2). R.McL. Wilson, "The Spirit in Gnostic Literature" in Christ and the Spirit in the New Testament, p.350, appears to identify the spirit as the biological principle and the power as the spiritual, failing to note the identification of BG 51,14 - 52,1 and parr.
321. Cf. PS Book III, ch.131 (Schmidt-MacDermot 332-7).
322. Cf. BG 67,14-18; CG III 34,15-18; CG II 26,20-2 ; CG IV 41,6-10.
323. CG II 26,15-18; CG IV 40,32-41,4. Significantly, the long recension later agrees with the short in identifying the soul with the power (CG II 26,26; CG IV 41,14, cf. BG 68,4f.; CG III 34,22).
324. BG 67,7-13; CG III 34,9-14. The long recension's Vorlage may have had the power increasing and the spirit coming, and it switched the two round, either because John's previous question suggested that the power came into man too (cf. CG II 26,9f.), or because the first term was omitted and only the spirit mentioned. The Pistis Sophia has the counterfeit spirit and the power increase, and there may be some indirect influence from this source or from the tradition common to both. Certainly both the long recension of the Apocryphon at this point and the Pistis Sophia (unlike the short recension here and both short and long in the next passage) distinguish the soul and the power.
325. Loc. cit.

326. Cf. BG 55,3-11 and parr., and BG 63,5-9 and parr., where the counterfeit spirit is the agent of human procreation. See on this Janssens, art.cit., pp.423f.
327. Cf. BG 74,6-10; CG III 38,16-20; CG II 29,21-6; CG IV 45,21-7.
328. Cf. IQS iii.18 - iv.18 on the two angels or spirits and the two spirits in man. See W.D. Davies, "Paul on Flesh and Spirit", in The Scrolls and the New Testament (ed. K. Stendahl), London, 1958, pp.172f.
329. Cf. Böhlig, Mysterion und Wahrheit, p.171. Thus in AJ BG 65,11 - 66,1 and parr. the souls in purgatory are free from passions and desire and make use of the flesh as a servant only.
330. So Böhlig, *ibid.*, p.162 (with reference to IQS iii.17etc.); Hauschild, *ibid.*
331. Cf. IQS iii.18 - iv.1, esp. iii.25. On the theme of the Spirit in Gnostic literature see Wilson, art.cit., pp.345-55.
332. BG 66, 13-67,4; CG III 33,23 - 34,6; CG II 26,7-12; CG IV 40,20-8. CG II 26,10f. has omitted the mention of the spirit's descent, mistaking the words of the question for the corresponding words of the answer, according to Giversen, Apocryphon, p.266. We have already noticed a certain careless tendency on the part of the scribe of the Codex II version.
333. Adv.haer. I 6,2 (Harvey I 54); cf. Epiph.Pan. XXXI 7,8. Epiphanius may simply be echoing Irenaeus, whose account he goes on to relate, but he may have had independent information. Cf. BG 67,2f.; CG III 34,5f.; CG II 26,11; CG IV 40,27. All have  $\pi\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\nu\tau\eta\varsigma$   $\pi\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\nu\tau\omega\varsigma$  and a future form of the verb.
334. CG I 119,16-18. Cf. 119,33 where it is said of the psychic race that they will be saved entirely (  $\pi\alpha\lambda\acute{\iota}\nu\tau\omega\varsigma$  ).
335. On the soul's need for perfection etc. cf. BG 65,6-8 and parr.; on the soul's purification cf. BG 65,8f. and parr. (and IQS iv.20); on its endurance and struggle cf. BG 66,8 - 13 and parr. (the  $\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{o}\nu$  of CG II 26,6 is probably an error since CG IV 40,18f. has  $\alpha\theta\lambda\acute{o}\nu$  as do BG 66,11 and CG III 33,22, echoing the NT picture of II Tim.4:7 (and IQS iv.18?)).

The continuation: "inherit eternal life" also recalls NT passages like Matt. 19:29; Mark 10:17; Luke 10:25; 18:18. On the soul's strengthening by the spirit cf. BG 67, 10-14 and parr.; on the imperishable oversight ( $\epsilon\pi\iota\sigma\kappa\omicron\pi\upsilon\varsigma$ ) cf. BG 68, 9-12 and parr. (and IQS iv. 6.12.18); on the saving knowledge cf. BG 68, 14 and parr., which deals with those who did not know "the All" (cf. IQS iv. 22); on the fate of those who know but turn away cf. BG 70, 9-71, 2 and parr.

336. Cf. Iren. adv. haer. I 6, 1 (Harvey I 52); 6, 4 (Harvey I 58); 7, 1 (Harvey I 58f.); 7, 5 (Harvey I 65); Exc. ex Theod. 57 (Sagnard 174); 67f. (Sagnard 190-2); 79 (Sagnard 202).
337. Cf. Valentinus frag. 2 in Clem. Alex. Strom. II 20, 114, 3-6 (Stählin 2, 174.31-175.14). Cf. GPh CG II 65, 1 - 66, 4.
338. Hipp. Ref. VI 34, 6 (Wendland 163.13-19).
339. Cf. Iren. adv. haer. I 30, 5 (Harvey I 232: the origin of the serpent son and evil); 30, 8 (Harvey I 234f.: the dew of light described as spirit and divine substance, and the seven worldly demons' resistance to the human race); 30, 9 (Harvey I 236: Cain seduced by the serpent and his seven sons as the first to reveal envy and death); 30, 14 (Harvey I 240: the souls of those who have known them (eos; the saving mysteries or Christ and the Father?) are described as holy and possessing the divine power).
340. BG 68, 13 - 69, 14; CG III 35, 2-18; CG II 26, 32 - 27, 11; CG IV 41, 21-42, 10.
341. BG 71, 2-5; CG III 36, 15-17; CG II 27, 31-3 ( $\pi\epsilon\pi\tilde{\nu}\delta\epsilon\tau\omega\eta\varsigma$ ); CG IV 43, 6-8.
342. BG 74, 6-10; CG III 38, 16-20; CG II 29, 21-6; CG IV 45, 21-7.
343. BG 71, 5-14; CG II 27, 33 - 28, 5; CG IV 43, 9-17. CG III 36, 18 - 37, 1 begins with a passage which has no parallel in the other versions, and which is unfortunately very fragmentary. It appears to refer to a vision of the Saviour in which he saw in the spirit (something) within the one (f.) rich in mercy (?  $\pi\epsilon\varsigma\epsilon\iota$  : Krause in his translation and apparatus ad loc. reads  $\pi\epsilon\varsigma\tilde{\nu}\delta$  as in BG 71, 6).

344. BG 52,17-53,17; CG III 24,25 - 25,17; CG II 20,9-24; CG IV 31,3-24. BG 53,12 and CG II 20, 20 have the same verb (  $\psi\epsilon\pi\alpha\iota\lambda\epsilon$  ) as CG II 28,1 (  $\psi\pi\alpha\iota\lambda\epsilon$  ), BG 71,8 and CG III 36,21 having a similar form (  $\alpha\iota\lambda\epsilon$  ). See Crum, Dictionary 710b, 812a-b.
345. BG 63, 14-64,13; CG III 32,8-22; CG II 25,2-16; CG IV 38,28-39,15. The present passage (CG II 27,34 - 28,3) confirms that the long recension, which has the seed as subject (CG II 25, 9-11; CG IV 39, 7-9), is incorrect.
346. CG II 28,1f.; CG IV 43,12f.
347. Cf. its addition of Pronoia in e.g. CG II 23,24.29; 24,13. But, as Janssens notes (art.cit. p.426), the salvific work of the Epinoia is always linked to that of the Pronoia.
348. See above, p.528 n. 257.
349. CG II 27,35; CG IV 43,10f. Cf. TrimProt CG XIII 35,11-18 (the Protennoia dwells in every creature); 45,21ff. (she hid herself in everyone); 49,6ff. (she dwelt in everyone [in the form of each] one).
350. Cf. CG II 30,13f.; CG IV 46,25-8 (the Pronoia changed herself in her seed and was the first to walk in every path); CG II 30,24; CG IV 47,11f. (the speaker calls herself the recollection (  $\pi\rho\pi\alpha\mu\epsilon\epsilon\gamma\epsilon$  ) of the Pronoia).
351. Le Origini, p.501.
352. Cf. CG II 30, 21-32; CG IV 47, 8-22.
353. BG 71,9-14; CG III 36,22- 37,1. The "Perfect eternal man of light" appears to refer to Adamas, cf. BG 35,3f., or perhaps Barbelo, cf. BG 27,10-20.
354. Cf. BG 55,15-18; CG III 27,2-4; CG II 21,14-16; CG II 23,30f.; CG IV 36,27f.
355. CG II 28,2-5; CG IV 43,12-17. Thus the long recension takes  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\iota\omicron\upsilon\omicron\omicron$  with  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\alpha$  rather than with  $\rho\omega\mu\epsilon$  (as in BG 35,3; CG III 13,1f.; CG II 8,32), leaving the identity of this race much less clear than in the short, and it has the masculine prefix  $\pi\epsilon\gamma$ -, which suggests that the original link was with the seed (  $\pi\epsilon\epsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha$  ) rather than with what is now the nearest noun, the feminine  $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\alpha$  .



356. The same verb (ΤΟΥΝΟC) as is found in BG 71,10f.; CG III 36,23 and CG II 28,3 occurs in the Sahidic of Gen. 4: 25 (ΤΟΥΝΕC), printed by Wessely, loc.cit., representing the LXX ἐξάνεο-τησ-ε. Cf. Crum, Dictionary 446b.
357. There may be a deliberate play on two ways of using ΤΟΥΝΟC (or ἐξάνιστάται) here.
358. See above p.533 n.309.
359. BG 71,14-72,2; CG III 37,1-6; CG II 28,5-11; CG IV 43,17-24. Here we have a combination of the ideas of man's superior (intellectual) height (cf. BG 54,7-11; CG III 26,2-6; CG II 20,30-3; CG IV 32,3-7) and greater wisdom (cf. BG 52,8-14; CG III 24,17-22; CG II 20,3-7; CG IV 30,22-8; BG 58,9f.; CG III 28,24f.), but while the short recension combines the two, the long sets them side by side, in a further effort to stress the distance between the Demiurge and the spiritual world.
360. Cf. the role of man's Nous and Enthymesis in the Ophite system in Iren. adv.haer. I 30,6 (Harvey I 233).
361. CG II 28,10f.; CG IV 43,23f.
362. BG 72,2-4; CG III 37,6f.; CG II 28,11-15; CG IV 43,24-9. CG III 37,6f., perhaps accidentally, omits to mention the powers, and thus has the chief archon produce Fate.
363. CG II 28,12-15; CG IV 43,26-9. Giversen's rendering of CG II 28,13: "they committed adultery with each other's wisdom" (Apocryphon, p.101) seems preferable to Krause's "sie brachen miteinander die Ehe mit Sophia" (Die drei Versionen, p.189), which is echoed in the English translation by Wisse in The Nag Hammadi Library in English, p.114.
364. CG II 28,15-30; CG IV 43,29 - 44,17. The mention of gods, angels, demons and every (human) race being united (with a fetter, i.e. time? - the object is feminine, as is fetter) has a parallel in BG 72,6-10; CG III 37,9-12, which refers to the archons binding the gods of heaven, angels, demons, and men with times and seasons that they be in the fetter of Heimarmene. This is omitted in the long recension at that point (presumably because the theme has already been dealt with), obscuring the sense and suggesting the secondary nature of the long recension's digression.



365. On the Letter Omega § 5 (Scott-Ferguson, Hermetica IV, 105, 10f.).
366. Ibid., § 12 (Scott-Ferguson 107.11-15).
367. Ibid., § 8 (Scott-Ferguson 106.6-12); 14f. (ibid., 107.25 - 108.12).
368. Ibid., §§ 16-18 (Scott-Ferguson 108.21- 109.19).
369. OnOrWld CG II 123,4-24. Cf. 125,28f. where the Heimarmene of the seven archons is found to be subject to condemnation as a result of the appearance of the perfect Gnostics in the world. But in CG II 121,13-20 the archons are unable to reduce the lifetimes of men because of the fixed nature of Heimarmene. In the Poimandres, too, Heimarmene is ambivalent: in CH I 9 the government of the seven Administrators (the planets) is described as  $\epsilon\iota\mu\alpha\rho\mu\epsilon\nu\eta$  ; in I 15 man is subject to  $\epsilon\iota\mu\alpha\rho\mu\epsilon\nu\eta$  ; in I 16 the nature of the seven, which the Anthropos possesses, is that of the superior elements, fire and spirit, yet in I 24-6 the powers of harmony or Fate are stripped off as the souls rise through the seven planetary spheres.
370. CG II 28,15-31. Cf. PS Book I, ch.22 (Schmidt-MacDermot 32.16ff.), where Philip asks the Lord whether he has turned the bondage of the archons and their Heimarmene and confused them to save the world, and Book III, ch. 111 (ibid., 284, 5-7), which speaks of man guided to death by the archons and their bonds ( $\overline{\mu}\rho\rho\epsilon$  ) with which they are bound by the Heimarmene.
371. Cf. BG 62,3-11; CG III 31,6-13; CG II 24,8-19; CG IV 37, 17-38,3.
372. Cf. CG II 14,9-13 (she is brought to the heaven of (or above;  $\overline{\nu}\tau\tau\epsilon$  ) her son).
373. Cf. Prov. 3:19; 8:22-31; Wisd. 7:21-30; 9: 1-3.
374. CG II 112,1-10; cf. 102,26 and especially 102,35 - 103,4, which speaks of heaven and earth, all the powers, and their whole organisation (  $\delta\iota\omicron\iota\kappa\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  ) having been established through the Sophia of Ialdabaoth. Cf. Prov. 8:27; Wisd. 7:22; 8:1.

375. CG II 125,23-9. Böhlig (on p.104 of his edition) finds an echo here of I Cor. 2: 6ff., where the wisdom of this aeon and its archons is contrasted with the secret wisdom of God. Cf. Wisd. 17:7.
376. BG 72,4-12; CG III 37,8-14; CG II 28,30-2; CG IV 44,18-20. We have attempted to show why the long recension omits the mention of the gods, angels etc. in BG 72,6-8. The continuation in BG 72,8-10; CG III 37,11f. ("that they should all be in its fetter") would no longer make sense once its subject had been removed, and the gloss in BG 72,11f.; CG III 37,13f. ("a wicked and perverse plan") would also make no sense once the previous clause had had to be changed from final to circumstantial. Both must therefore have been omitted.
377. Cf. TJ I on Gen. 6:4; I Enoch 6-7; 64: 1-2; Jubilees 5:1; Test.Reub. 5,6-7; Justin II Apol. 5 etc.
378. BG 72,12-17; CG III 37,14-18; CG II 28,32 - 29,1; CG IV 44,20-5. The Sahidic of Gen. 6:6 (Ciasca, p.2) has the same verb (ρζητ-) as BG 72,12f. and parr., and appears to be a free rendering of the LXX influenced perhaps by Gen. 6:8. Gen. 6:17 in Sahidic (ibid., p.3) has the same verb (ϵινε ) as CG II 28,35. The ἀναστειναι τῆς of the short recension (BG 72,16f.; CG III 37,17f.) is an exact echo of Gen. 7:4 and 23 LXX (παυτε ἀναστειναι ), which has escaped the notice of Till and Krause, who mistranslate ἀναστειναι as Überheblichkeit. (See pp.185 and 320 of Till's edition, pp.103 and 282 of Krause's edition).
379. BG 72,17 - 73,2; CG III 37,18-21; CG II 29,1-3; CG IV 44,25-7. All four versions have the term ὁ Πρωτοε, which is most common in Valentinian texts as a translation of ὁ Ἐγὼ Θεός, a term largely used of the supreme being, but which is here associated with the Pronoia, and identified as the Epinoia, the chief revealer/redeemer, of the main body of the Apocryphon, in the short recension. Cf. the rôle of Wisdom in Wisd. 10:4, and the description of her in 7:26. The Ophites of Iren. adv.haer. I 30,10 (Harvey I 236f.) have Sophia resist Ialdabaoth's decision to destroy all men for their refusal to worship and obey him, and speak of her saving Noah and those with him in the ark.

380. BG 60,16 - 61,4; CG III 30,14-19; CG II 23,24-35; CG IV 36,17 - 37,4.
381. Cf. 30,15f. ("I am the richness of the light, the remembrance of the Pleroma"); 30,24 ("I am the remembrance of the Pronoia"); 30,33f. ("I am the light which exists in the light, I am the remembrance of the Pronoia"); 31,11f. ("I am the Pronoia of pure light").
382. BG 73,2-4; CG III 37,21f.; CG II 29,3-6; CG IV 44,27 - 45,1. The long recension has added further detail to the bald account in the short: Noah told the whole race (συνεμνησθη), i.e. the children of men; it was those who were alien to him who did not listen. Cf. 2 Pet.2: 5; 1 Clem. 7,6. Cf. Josephus, Ant. I 3, 1 and the rabbinic theme of men's lack of belief in the Flood in Sanh. 108a-b; Gen. R. XXX 7; Tanh. Noah 5: Tanh.B 1,25 etc. See Ginzberg, Legends vols I p.153, V pp.174f.
383. BG 73,4-7; CG III 37,22 - 38,1; CG II 29,6-8; CG IV 45,1-5. The plural in the latter three may be the result of the influence of Gen. 7: 15 and 23. Cf. the following phrase in the Apocryphon: "not only Noah but the men of the immoveable race".
384. Cf. NatArch CG II 92,11 where the ruler of the forces tells Noah to hide (ἐκρυψε) in the ark. There is a related conception in ApocAd CG V 69,19-25: great angels will come in lofty clouds who will take the Gnostics into the place (τοπος) in which the spirit of life is. Cf. 75,17 - 76,7. The idea of the light cloud as a place of concealment appears to be a common Gnostic topos. It also occurs earlier in the Apocryphon: Sophia conceals her abortion in a light cloud (BG 38,6-13 and parr.). Cf. also Test. Abr. X (James, Texts and Studies 2,2, p.88 ).
385. BG 73,7-12; CG III 38,1-5; CG II 29,8-12; CG IV 45,5-9.
386. Cf. BG 60,16-19; CG III 30,14-17; CG II 23,24-6; CG IV 36,17-21: the Epinoia instructs Adam in knowledge through the heavenly αὐτογνωσία or through the Pronoia of the heavenly αὐτογνωσία.
387. The Sahidic of Gen. 7: 23b (Ciasca, p.6) reads: mn̄ n̄etnm̄m̄d̄q̄ n̄zoȳn̄ n̄tk̄īs̄w̄ t̄c̄ while BG 73,14f. has: mn̄ n̄etnm̄m̄d̄q̄ ὁ μ̄n̄ π̄ōȳᾱw̄. Cf. Iren. adv. haer. I 30,10 (Harvey I 237: eos ..... qui circa Noe erant in arca).

388. BG 73,16-18; CG III 38,8-10; CG II 29,14f.; CG IV 45,12-15.
389. The copyist may have misread an  $\delta\gamma-$ , expecting an  $\delta\gamma-$  following the previous plural form  $\delta\gamma\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\pi\alpha\zeta\epsilon$ .
390. Apocryphon, p.103. He takes  $\mathfrak{N}\delta\epsilon\mathfrak{N}\overline{\mathfrak{M}}\mathfrak{M}\delta\gamma$  to mean "be with", although what verbal form he presupposes is unclear.  $\mathfrak{N}\delta\epsilon$  appears to be a Present I rather than a past form. Wisse (Nag Hammadi Library, pp.114f.) appears to agree with Giversen. His translation runs: "she who belongs to the light was with him, having shone .....".
391. On p.192 of his edition. He takes  $\mathfrak{N}\delta\epsilon$  as the reflexive of  $\mathfrak{N}\delta$ , "to have pity" (cf. Crum, Dictionary 216b), governing  $\mathfrak{N}\overline{\mathfrak{M}}\mathfrak{M}\delta\gamma$ , "with (i.e. on?) him". However in Crum, loc.cit., neither the status pronominalis of  $\mathfrak{N}\delta$  nor its use with  $\mathfrak{M}\mathfrak{N}$ -occurs. The form  $\mathfrak{N}\delta$  meaning "go" does occur (cf. Crum, *ibid.*, 217b - 218a), and an alternative translation might be: "she of the light which shone on them went with him".
392. CG II 29,14f.; CG IV 45,12-14.
393. BG 73,16-18; CG III 38,9-10.
394. Cf. I Enoch 6:2 in R.H. Charles (ed.) The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, vol. II, Oxford 1913, p.191, where the editor refers to Jub. 4:15; 5:1; Test Reub. 5,6-7; Josephus Ant. I 3,1; Ps. Clem. Hom. VIII 13,1-2; Justin II Apol. 5 etc. On this see Janssens, Le Origini pp.488-94.
395. BG 73,18 - 74,6; CG III 38,10-16; CG II 29,16-21; CG IV 45,14-21. BG 74,1 has Ialdabaoth's angels send their angels. This is probably a mistaken attempt to avoid the clumsy repetition of angels in CG III 38,11f.; Ialdabaoth makes a plan with his angels, then sends his angels. CG II 29,16f. (= CG IV 45,14ff.) solves this by having Ialdabaoth plan with his powers and send his angels.
396. BG 74,6-10; CG III 38,16-20; CG II 29,21-6; CG IV 45,21-7. BG has omitted, possibly by accident, the clause: "when they realised they had been unsuccessful" in CG III 38,16f. and its equivalent in CG II 29,21 = CG IV 45,21: "when they were unsuccessful". The reading in BG 74,6: "They came down ( $\epsilon\lambda\theta\delta\iota$ ) all deciding", cannot be reconciled with the better

readings in CG III 38,17; "They all mutually decided", and CG II 29,21-3: "They again gathered together and once more decided", unless one presupposes a Greek form like  $\sigmaύνηλθον$  πάντες συμβουλιζόμενοι. The addition in the long recension of the reason: "to defile through it (the counterfeit spirit) the souls" (CG II 29,25f.; CG IV 45,26f.), is clearly secondary.

397. This term occurs five times in the long recension at CG II 26,27 = CG IV 41,15f.; II 26,36 = IV 41,25f.; II 27,32f. = IV 43,8; II 29,24 = IV 45,25; II 30,11 = IV 46,22.
398. On p.275 of his edition s.v.  $\omega\eta\epsilon$ . Böhlig, Mysterion und Wahrheit, p.164, suggests that Krause interprets  $\omega\eta\epsilon$  as the Qualitative of  $\epsilon\omega\omega$ , "despise" (Crum, Dictionary 375a), but rejects his translation, "widersätzliche".
399. Apocryphon, p.268. Böhlig, loc.cit., refers to Crum, Dictionary 606a. He prefers Krause's form but Giversen's meaning. Could  $\omega\eta\epsilon$  represent the Greek  $\acute{\alpha}\tau\mu\epsilon\nu$ , a misreading of an abbreviated form of  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\mu\mu\epsilon\nu$ ? Böhlig, *ibid.*, n.5, refers to the Sahidic of I Cor.12:23 where  $\acute{\alpha}\tau\mu\epsilon\varsigma$  is translated by  $\epsilon\eta\omega$ .
400. Cf. BG 63,16-64,2 and parr.
401. Cf. BG 53,4-17 and parr.; 71,7-14 and parr.; cf. CG II 25,3ff. = CG IV 38,29ff., which appear to interpret the Mother's spirit as the holy Spirit, thus resolving the dilemma. Janssens (art.cit., p.427) interprets the spirit who came down as the Epinoia.
402. Cf. BG 53,18-20 and parr. However, cf. BG 59,6-12 and parr., where Ialdabaoth knows that the Epinoia is in Adam and wants to bring her out.
403. *Ibid.*
404. On the Letter Omega §§ 8,11f.; 14f., 16-18 (Scott-Ferguson Hermetica IV 106-9).
405. BG 74,11-13; CG III 38,20-2; CG II 29,26-8; CG IV 45,27-9. Cf. Test.Reub. 5,6-7; Ps.Clem. Hom. VIII 13,1-2 (Rehm 126.28-127.7).



406. Krause reconstructs the circumstantial ( [εϛμοϛϛ̄ μ̄] ) in CG III 38,22 on the basis of CG II 29,28 ( εϛμοϛϛ̄ μ̄ ).
407. The μοϛκϛ of BG 74,14 may be an error for μοϛϛ or the μεϛ of CG III 38,24. The phrase "out of (or from) the darkness", which is awkward in all four texts, may originally have belonged to the following sentence, as Till (p.189 of his edition) takes it.
408. BG 74,16 - 75,1; CG III 38,25 - 39,3; CG II 29,30-4; CG IV 46,2-8. Cf. I Enoch 8:1; 65:6-8; Ps.Clem.Hom.VIII 14,1-3. The περισπασμός of CG III 39,3 may represent a misreading of the πειρασμός of BG 75,1. CG II 29,34 (= CG IV 46,7f.) has "great cares (ροοϛϛ)". However πειρασμός and περισπασμός are interchanged in the MSS traditions of Ecclesiastes LXX, e.g. at 3:10, 4:8 and 8:16, where A has π(ε)ιρασμός to the περισπασμός of X and B, and at 5:13 where X has π(ε)ιρασμός to the περισπασμός of A and B. 3:10 deals with the περισπασμός God has given the sons of men, and 8:16 with the περισπασμός done on earth. NatArch CG II 91,7f. combines the two versions of the Apocryphon, referring to the archons casting men into great περισπασμοί, and GEgypt CG III 61,14 refers to the temptations (πειρασμός) which the immovable race of Seth will undergo.
409. BG 75,1-3; CG III 39,4f. Cf the "eternal pronoiā" of Wisd.17:2.
410. Cf. CG II 6,5; 7,22 = IV 11,14; II 14,20 = IV 22,25; II 23,24 = IV 36,17; II 24,13f. = IV 37,24f.; II 28,2 = IV 43,13; II 30,12 = IV 46,24; II 30,24.35 = IV 47,12.26f.; II 31,11 = IV 48,14f. In these cases πρόϛιϛ occurs as a designation of Barbelo.
411. CG II 29,34 - 30,7; CG IV 46,8-16.
412. BG 75,3-7; CG III 39,5-8; CG II 30,7-9; CG IV 46,17-19. The long recension's reading: "after (κατὰ) the image of their spirit", is probably due to its conception of earthly generation as always after the image of the heavenly. Not only Adam is made in the heavenly image, as in the short recension, but Eve too, cf. CG II 22,34 - 23,2 = CG IV 35,16-22.
413. CG III 39,8; CG II 30,9; CG IV 46,19f., cf. BG 20,1; CG II 1,16. τωμ can stand for πωρεϛν or τυφλεϛν, cf. Crum, Dictionary 412b. BG 75,7 has "he hardened

(ἀγτωμ)", perhaps recalling II Cor. 4:4 (the god of this aeon  $\epsilon\tau\phi\lambda\omega\sigma\epsilon\nu\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\ \nu\omicron\mu\acute{\alpha}\tau\alpha\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \alpha\pi\iota\sigma\tau\omega\nu$ ) or John 12: 40 ( $\epsilon\pi\acute{\omega}\rho\omega\sigma\epsilon\nu\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \tau\eta\nu\ \kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$  ; Sahidic  $\tau\omega\mu\ \bar{\text{N}}\bar{\text{A}}\text{HT}$  ; Crum, Dictionary 412b), a citation of Is. 6:10.

414. BG 75,7-10; CG III 39,9-11; CG II 30,10f.; CG IV 46,20-3.
415. Cf. e.g. Exod. 8:15,32; 9:7 (LXX:  $\beta\alpha\rho\acute{\upsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu\ \tau\eta\nu\ \kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ ); 4:21 (Sah  $\dagger\ \text{N}\omega\sigma\tau$ ); 9:34; 10:1 (LXX  $\sigma\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\acute{\upsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu\ \tau\eta\nu\ \kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$ ); Is. 6:10 (LXX  $\eta\ \kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \pi\alpha\chi\upsilon\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  = Sah  $\text{N}\omega\gamma\tau$ ; Crum, Dictionary 237a, cf. Sah of Matt. 13:15; Acts 28:27); Ps. 95(94):8 (LXX  $\sigma\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\acute{\upsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu\ \tau\eta\nu\ \kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$  = Sah  $\dagger\ \text{N}\omega\sigma\tau$  ; Crum, Dictionary 238a; cf. Sah of Heb. 3:8); Deut. 9:27 (LXX  $\sigma\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\eta\varsigma$  = Sah  $\text{N}\omega\sigma\tau$  ; Crum, Dictionary 238a); John 12:40 ( $\pi\omega\rho\acute{\omega}\nu\ \tau\eta\nu\ \kappa\alpha\rho\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha\nu$  = Sah  $\tau\omega\mu$  ; Crum, Dictionary 412b); Rom. 9:18 ( $\sigma\kappa\lambda\eta\rho\acute{\upsilon}\nu\epsilon\iota\nu$  = Sah  $\text{N}\omega\sigma\tau$  ; Crum, Dictionary 237a).
416. BG 75,10-13; CG III 39,11-13. The  $\text{N}\delta\iota\alpha\tau$ - of BG 75,10 is an exact Coptic translation of the  $\mu\alpha\kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$  of CG III 39,11. Arai's argument (art.cit., p. 307 n.1) that  $\bar{\text{N}}\epsilon\iota\omega\tau$  is an attribute, "vaterlich", may be grammatically correct, but he fails to realise that it probably represents an attempt to render the  $\mu\eta\tau\rho\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\rho$  of the long recension into Coptic. It is characteristic of the  $\mu\eta\tau\rho\pi\acute{\alpha}\tau\omega\rho$  to be  $\mu\alpha\kappa\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$  and rich in mercy rather than Sophia, who has to ask for help, and traces of whose saving role are played down or removed. Cf. CG II 19,17f.; 27,37f. (and parallels in CG IV).
417. BG 75,14f.; CG III 39,13f. "The perfect aeon" is a designation of Barbelo in BG 27,14f.; CG III 7,19. Cf. Eph. 4:8-10.
418. BG 75,15-76,1; CG III 39,14-18; CG II 2,28-32; CG IV 49,9-13. On the details see below. Cf. BG 22,10-17; CG II 2,21-6; CG IV 3,16-23.
419. Hennecke-Schneemelcher, I, p.327.
420. BG 76,1-5; CG III 39,18-21. CG III 39,19 reads: "this ( $\tau\epsilon\epsilon\tau$ ) Mother".
421. BG 76,5f.; CG III 39,21f. However, this may merely be an echo of the Saviour's statement in the prologue, cf. BG 22,2-9; CG II 2,16-25.



422. BG 76, 7-77,5; CG III 39,22 - 40,10; CG II 31,32 - 32,5; CG IV 49,13-26.
423. CG II 32,6; CG IV 49,26. Cf. CG II 1,1-4; CG IV 1,1-3.
424. CG II 30,11-31,25; CG IV 46,23-49,6.
425. CG II 31,25-7; CG IV 49,6-8.
426. Art.cit., pp.311-14.
427. Ibid., pp.309-11. He also appeals to the use of  $\alpha\iota\mu\omicron\rho\phi\eta$  in the Sahidic of Gal. 4:19 as indicating that the term is an eschatological one not only among Valentinians but also among other Gnostics and Christians.
428. Ibid., p.315.
429. See above p.546 and n. 416.
430. Ibid., p.311. His argument about a retrospective allusion is weak.
431. Cf. BG 31,3f.; CG II 6,31f.; CG IV 10,10f.; CG II 14,20; CG IV 22,25 and CG II 30,12; CG IV 46,24.
432. Cf. CG II 20,10; CG IV 31,5 and CG II 31,16; CG IV 48,22.
433. Cf. BG 27,11f.; CG II 4,32f. and CG II 30,33f.; CG IV 47,24-6.
434. Cf. BG 27,10 = CG III 7,16; BG 28,10 = CG III 8,16f. ; BG 30,13f. = CG III 9,22f. On the principle of the secondary character of such harmonising identifications, whereby the first-named is the original, see Krause, Le Origini, p.75.
435. BG 21,3 - 22,9; CG II 2,1-20.
436. See on this Puech in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, I, p.321 n.1.
- 436a. See on this the French translation and notes by Y.Janssens, "Le Codex XIII de Nag Hammadi", Muséon 87 (1974), pp.341-413. She would apparently ascribe the work to the Barbelognostics (ibid., p.413, although on p.348 she attributes the Apocryphon, whose many parallels to the Protennoia she notes, to the Barbelognostics/Sethians). However the German translation

by the Berlin Arbeitskreis with G. Schenke as editor,  
 ' "Die dreigestaltige Protennoia": Eine gnostische Offenbarungsrede  
 in koptischer Sprache aus dem Fund von Nag Hammadi',  
ThLZ 99 (1974), cols. 731-46, finds the work clearly Sethian  
 (col. 731) and in substance a document unaffected by Christianity  
 (ibid., 733). Furthermore, the group argue that the third  
 revelation discourse, which offers a material parallel to the  
 Prologue of the Fourth Gospel, casts more light on the Prologue  
 than vice versa (ibid., 734). Wilson, "The Trimorphic  
Protennoia", Gnosis and Gnosticism : Papers read at the  
 Seventh International Conference on Patristic Studies, Oxford,  
 September 8th-13th 1975 (= Nag Hammadi Studies vol. VIII),  
 Leiden 1977, pp. 50-4, discusses the question of whether the  
 Protennoia represents a Christianization of a non-Christian  
 Gnostic original, or whether we ought not sometimes to con-  
 sider the possibility, as in this case, of de-Christianization,  
 although the latter would not rule out the existence at some  
 prior stage of a non-Christian original. He points to the fact  
 that the Sethian and Barbelognostic systems as we have them  
 show some degree of Christian influence and suggests that the  
 Christian element in the Protennoia is stronger than the Berlin  
 group recognised.

437. Cf. AJ BG 27, 17-28, 2; CG III 7, 22 - 8, 3; CG II 5, 4-10;  
 CG IV 7, 20-25 and TrimProt CG XIII 35, 1-6; 37, 20-7 (the  
 three names: Father, Mother, Son?); 38, 7-10.
438. Cf. AJ BG 27, 12f.; CG II 4, 34f. and TrimProt CG XIII 38, 11.
439. Cf. TrimProt CG XIII 35, 12-24; 38, 11-16; 42, 9-17; 45, 2-10;  
 47, 28-35 and AJ BG 21, 18-22, 9; CG II 2, 12-20; CG IV 3, 5-16;  
 CG II 30, 11-16. 24. 33-5 = CG IV 46, 23 - 47, 2. 11f. 24-7;  
 CG II 31, 11-14 = CG IV 48, 14-18. See also OnOrWld CG II  
 114, 7-15 and Brontē CG VI, 2 passim. On this see G.W. MacRae  
 "Discourses of the Gnostic Revealer" in Proceedings of the  
International Colloquium on Gnosticism, Stockholm, August  
 20-25 1973, Stockholm 1977, pp. 11-22; "The Ego-Proclamation  
 in Gnostic Sources" in The Trial of Jesus: Cambridge Studies  
 in honour of C.F.D. Moule, ed. E. Bammel (= Studies in  
 Biblical Theology, Second Series, 13), London 1970, pp. 129-34.
440. Cf. TrimProt CG XIII 40, 8 - 42, 3; 42, 17 - 45, 2; 47, 11-35;  
 48, 12-35; 49, 6-37; 50, 7-20.

441. AJ CG II 31,23 -5; CG IV 49,2-6. Cf. GEgypt CG III 62,24-64,3.
442. Cf. AJ CG II 30,16-21 = CG IV 47,2-8 and TrimProt CG XIII 36,4f.; 40,12-22. 29f.; 43,8.
443. TrimProt CG XIII 37,3-20.
444. 47,13-50,16.
445. Cf. BG 19,16-20,3; CG II 1,30-3.
446. See n.439.
447. BG 20,20f.; CG II 1,30-3.
448. Cf. CG II 30,13-20; 30,32-31,13 and par. Giversen, Apocryphon, p.271, argues that the third descent is to John, but the descriptions do not tally sufficiently to bear this out. Schottroff, too, rejects Giversen's thesis on this and related grounds, cf. "Heil als innerweltliche Entweltlichung: Der gnostische Hintergrund der johanneischen Vorstellung vom Zeitpunkt der Erlösung", Novum Testamentum 11 (1969), p.305.
449. BG 20,9-11; CG II 1,22.
450. Apocryphon, pp.272f. He draws attention to Till's remark (on p.191 - not p.141 as quoted by Arai, art.cit., p.315 n.1 - of his edition) about the incoherence of the text.
451. Der Glaubende, pp.108f.
452. CG III 39,19. Giversen, Apocryphon, p.273, takes  $\tau\mu\delta\delta\gamma$  to refer to the Pronoia.
453. See n.244.
454. Cf. BG 63,16 - 64,5 on the Mother sending her Spirit to work on the seed akin to him.
455. Cf. BG 47, 5-14, esp. 13f.; CG III 9,16 esp. 15f.; CG II 14,9-13 (  $\zeta\omega\tau\epsilon$  ); CG II 23,22 (  $\zeta\omega\tau\epsilon$  ); CG III 30,12; BG 60,14. The redactors of BG may have misread  $\delta\sigma\tau\epsilon\rho\eta\mu\eta$ , perhaps understanding  $\tau\alpha\lambda\omicron\epsilon\rho\delta\tau$  - either in the sense of  $\kappa\upsilon\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\iota$  (  $\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\eta$  ; cf. Gen 4:25 LXX) or  $\delta\iota\omicron\rho\theta\omicron\upsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$  (  $\sigma\pi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\eta$  ; cf. the Valentinian usage in

- Exc. ex Theod. 35,2 : Sagnard 136). Both senses would, of course, suit Sophia. Till (on p.190 of his edition) suggests reading  $\pi\epsilon\kappa\kappa\tau\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha$  for  $\pi\epsilon\kappa\tau\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha$  in II.4f.
456. Thus in CG II 27,33 - 28,2 = CG IV 43,9-13 the long recension omits to distinguish the Metropator from the holy Spirit; adds that the latter is "in every form", recalling CG II 30,13f. and par.; adds the epithet "the merciful ( $\pi\omega\delta\alpha\nu\upsilon\tau\eta\varsigma$ )" which the Pronoia uses of herself in CG II 31,16 and par., and qualifies the Epinoia as being "of the light Pronoia". The description of the eschatological Spirit's work in CG II 25,13f. ( $\epsilon\omega\tau\epsilon\epsilon\rho\alpha\tau-$ ) is echoed in the work of the Saviour/Pronoia in CG II 31,13 = CG IV 48,17f. ( $\epsilon\omega\tau\epsilon\epsilon\rho\alpha\iota$ ).
457. In CG II 31,13f. = CG IV 48,17f., the Saviour/Pronoia says on his/her third descent: "I am the one who raises you up ( $\epsilon\omega\tau\epsilon\epsilon\rho\alpha\iota$ )... Raise yourself ( $\tau\omega\upsilon\gamma\eta\kappa$ )".  $\epsilon\omega\tau\epsilon$  in the long recension is the equivalent of  $\tau\alpha\lambda\omicron\epsilon\rho\alpha\tau-$  in the short. See preceding note.
458. Art.cit., pp.309-11. He refers to Iren. adv.haer. I 6,1; 7,1; II 19,1-4; Exc. ex Theod. 57; 59,1; GTr CG I 27,15-31; Untitled Text in the Bruce Codex (Baynes IX and XLIX = Schmidt-MacDermot 254.1.17).
459. See Arai's Valentinian references in preceding note and Exc. ex Theod. 34,2 (Sagnard 134) and 35,4 (Sagnard 138); TriTrac CG I 94,10f. (the pneumatics received  $\mu\omicron\rho\phi\eta$  with the Logos/Sophia).
460. Cf. Iren. adv.haer. I 5,1 (Harvey I 42).
461. Cf. Exc. ex Theod. 32,3 - 33,4 (Sagnard 128-132); Iren. adv.haer. I 11,1 (Harvey I 100); TriTrac CG I 77,37 - 78,8; ValExp CG XI 33,35ff.
462. Cf. Hipp. Ref. VI 32,4f. (Wendland 160.20-3:  $\delta\iota\omicron\rho\theta\omega\tau\eta\varsigma$  ...  $\delta\iota\omicron\rho\theta\omega\tau\omicron$  ...  $\delta\iota\omicron\rho\theta\omega\mu\epsilon\nu\omicron$ ): Exc. ex Theod. 35,2 (Sagnard 136:  $\epsilon\iota\varsigma\delta\iota\omicron\rho\theta\omega\sigma\iota\nu\tau\omicron\upsilon\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ).
463. The Trimorphic Protennoia, with its parallel tradition to the frame story and details of the central exposition in the Apocryphon, shows far less evidence of Valentinian influence or terminology. Its version of the triple descent of Protennoia/Barbelo as Father, Mother, and Son - and hence the related version in the long recension of the Apocryphon - may be dependent on pre-Valentinian traditions.

464. Art.cit., passim. On the last point he is clearly inaccurate. He omits the allusions to John 1:5 in BG 59,11f. and to Rev.22:1 in BG 26,18 noted by Till in his edition. For a list of further allusions and possible parallels see Wilson, Gnosis, pp.106f. In any case, the secret teaching is largely concerned with the interpretation of Genesis 1-7, and one would not expect many NT references.
465. Cf. Iren adv.haer. I 29,1-3 (Harvey I 222-4); GEgypt CG III 41,7- 43,8 = CG IV 50,23 - 53,3 (the Son, i.e. Christ? cf. CG III 44,22f.; IV 55,12); CG IV 60,1f.; CG III 49,17 (the Autogenes); TrimProt CG XIII 38,16-23 (the Son, Christ, the Self-begotten).
466. Cf. Iren. adv.haer. I 29,1 (Harvey I 222); TrimProt CG XIII 37,31f. Cf. GEgypt CG III 44,23f. = IV 55,12f. which appears to refer to Christ (or the thrice male child, his son?) as anointed by the great invisible Spirit.
467. Cf. Ps. Clem.Hom. III 20,2 (Rehm 64.4-7, esp.7).
468. Der Glaubende, p.100.
469. Le Origini, p.497 n.1. Arai, art.cit., p.314 n.3 also appears to share this view.
470. Apocryphon, p.270.
471. Ibid., pp.498-502.
472. Ibid., p.502.
473. Ibid., pp.271ff. See n.448.
474. GEgypt CG III 62,24 - 63,13 = CG IV 74,9-29.
475. ApocAd CG V 76,8-17.
476. Cf. AJ CG II 31,4; TrimProt CG XIII 47,13-16; 50,12f.; GEgypt CG III 63,10-13 = CG IV 74,24-9; III 64,1-3 = IV 75,15-17; ApocAd CG V 76,28 - 77,18. That the last alludes to the descent of the heavenly Christ on Jesus is suggested by comparison with GrSeth CG VII 51,20 - 52,17; 55,9 - 56,29. In the case of TrimProt, Wilson, "The

Trimorphic Protennoia", pp.52-4 has pointed to Christian elements and allusions. In the case of the Apocalypse, however, MacRae, "The Coptic Gnostic Apocalypse of Adam", The Heythrop Journal 6 (1965), pp.32-4, has argued, following up Böhlig's suggestion (on pp.90f. of his edition), that it probably represents a genuinely pre-Christian form of Gnosticism, in which the Phoster episode (76,28 - 77,27 etc.) can be accounted for as a sort of Gnostic midrash built on the suffering Servant-Messiah of Deutero-Isaiah. Schottroff, "Animae naturaliter salvandae", pp.82f. has contested this on the grounds that the Redeemer does not suffer - it is the Gnostic salvandus who is so described (76,28 - 77,27), and that, in any case, the parallels with Deutero-Isaiah are too vague. However, she would agree with MacRae about the presence of Jewish ideas and lack of acquaintance with Christianity shown by it, although she insists that non-Christian does not mean pre-Christian, and assigns the work to the third or fourth century A.D. But Schottroff's claim that it is the salvandus who suffers is questionable, since the passage clearly speaks of the third descent of the Redeemer, and since there are various parallels to this (e.g. GrSeth CG VII loc.cit., Zos. On the Letter Omega § 8 (Scott-Ferguson Hermetica IV 106.6-12); Gr Power CG VI 41,7 - 32,11) which make clear the docetic character of this event. The identification of the Suffering Servant-Messiah of Deutero-Isaiah with the Saviour, and the docetic interpretation of that suffering, appear to be specifically associated with early Christian interpretation of the person of Christ.

477. Cf. AJ CG II 31,23ff.; TrimProt CG XIII 48,30ff.; 49,29ff.; 50,9f.; GEgypt CG III 63,3 = CG IV 74,16; CG III 66,2f. which refer to the five seals (but cf. GEgypt CG IV 78,4f which does not have "five". See Böhlig-Wisse, The Gospel of the Egyptians, p.197). In GEgypt CG IV 56,24f., the five seals appear to apply to the seal imprint of the trinity and not to the five sacraments of e.g. the Gospel of Philip according to Böhlig and Wisse (ibid., p.174, cf. p.50). However they accept that the references to the five seals in CG III 55,12 and 66,3, although secondary, since they are lacking in CG IV, do signify the sacraments (ibid., pp.174f.). ApocAd CG V 76,51f. appears to describe how the Phoster seals ( Ⲭⲏⲥⲫⲣⲁⲩⲧⲓⲥⲉ ) men in the (name?) of Seth. It is worth noting that the Paraphrase of Shem (ParShem, CG VII,1) also appears to have traces of the idea of a multiple, perhaps triple, descent of the Redeemer (Derdekeas) in the context of a polemic against water-baptism. Cf. CG VII 15,28ff.; 18,12ff.; 21,12ff.; 28,27ff.; 30,21 - 31,4; 32,5-17; 36,11-32; 37,6-35; 38,4-32, etc.



478. On this attribution cf. H.-M. Schenke in ThLZ 100 (1975), col.97 etc.
479. Schottroff, "Animae naturaliter salvandae ..." in Christentum und Gnosis (BZNW 37) 1969, p.71 n.17, ascribes the first advent to 69,19-25 before the Flood; the second to 71,8 - 72,14; and the third to 75,17ff. as a result of the fire (of Sodom?). But the third advent is not mentioned till 76,8, which Schottroff is thus forced to count as a fourth! She suggests that since one cannot explain the third advent from the text the motif may derive from the Manichean figure of the Third Messenger, as Böhlig suggests on p.90 of his edition. One might argue that the scheme can be fitted in if one places the advents after the rescue by the angels of the elect race from flood and conflagration, but while this would fit at 71,10f., there is no room before 76,8ff. for a second advent.
480. It also appears to underlie the evidently non-Christian Paraphrase of Shem. Cf. F. Wisse, "The Redeemer Figure in the Paraphrase of Shem", Novum Testamentum XII (1970), pp.135-40. See n. 477. Puech has drawn attention to a tradition found in pagan sources of the fourth century AD (including Book I of Julian the Apostate's contra Galileos) that Hermes Trismegistus came to Egypt or was born three times, and in the third advent he remembered himself ( ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ ἀνγλυνοῦσθαι ) or recognised himself ( ἐξ ἑαυτοῦ ἐπιγινώσκειν ) and received his true name. ("Hermes trois fois incarné: sur quelques témoignages négligés relatifs à l'hermetisme" in En quête de la Gnose I: La Gnose et le temps, Paris 1978, pp.117f. (= Revue des études grecques LIX-LX (1946/47) pp.XI - XIII). However, as he himself notes, Trismegistus is here conceived as a type or model of the "Gnostic", the first and outstanding example of a being saved by gnosis (ibid., p.118). It is not at all likely that such a motif formed the basis of the triple descent of the heavenly Revealer/Redeemer who called others to awaken to their true nature and brought the heavenly gnosis.
481. Schenke, "Die neutestamentliche Christologie", p.217, would see the triple parousia as the concretion of the principle of continuous revelation: the redeemer enters anew the three ages following Adam (Seth; the primal Sethians; the present Sethians). However, that principle in the Apocryphon and the Trimorphic Protennoia is represented by the Epinoia or Protennoia in men, and the scheme only fits the Gospel of the Egyptians.



482. Hennecke-Schneemelcher, I, p.327.
483. Cf. AJ CG II 30,16-21. 25-31,4 (= CG IV 47,2-6.12-48,5); TrimProt CG XIII 36,4f.; 37,3-20; 40,11-13.29ff.; 45,21ff.; 47,13-25 etc.
484. Hauptprobleme, ch.6, esp. pp.242, 255-60.
485. Ibid., p.242.
486. Ibid., p.255. He cites I Pet. 3:19; 4:6; Eph.4:9; Matt. 12:40; Acts 2:24.27.31; Rom.10:6; Rev. 1:18.
487. Ibid., pp.255f.
488. Ibid., p.256 n.1. This could be interpreted as a triple parousia! Puech, loc.cit., refers to the same verse as well as to the Descensus motif and the awakening of Adam in Manicheism. MacRae, "Discourses on the Gnostic Revealer", p.116, refers to Conzelmann's demonstration ("The Mother of Wisdom" in The Future of our Religious Past, London 1971, pp.230-43), with reference to Ecclus 24, of the influence of the Isis hymns on Jewish Wisdom Literature.
489. Ibid., p.259. The texts cited by Bousset to illustrate the descent of Christ and the assimilation motif are: Iren. adv. haer. I 23,3; 24,2.3.6f.; Epiph. Pan. XXI 3; XXVI 9; PS ch. 8 p.7.26ff.; Asc.Is. chs. 10,7ff.; 11,22.
490. Adv. haer. I 27,2 (Harvey I 218f.).
491. E.g. Prov. 3:18; 8:22-31; 9:1; Wisd. 7:22-8:1; 9; 10 etc.
492. Wisd. 7:22f.,cf. AJ BG 53,4ff. and parr.; 71,7ff. and parr. (Epinoia); TrimProt CG XIII 41,20ff.; 45,29 ff. (the spirit of Sophia and of Protennoia).
493. Wisd. 7:26. Cf. AJ BG 27,1-19 and parr. (Barbelo); CG II 30,33ff. and parr. (Pronoia).
494. Wisd. 7:24; 8:1; 14:3-5. Cf. the Protennoia in TrimProt CG XIII 35,11-20 etc.
495. Wisd. 7:27.

496. Wisd. 9:10. Cf. the role of the Epinoia/holy Spirit in AJ BG 53,4ff. and parr.; 71,5ff. and parr.; the role of the Mother's spirit in 63,15ff. and parr., and of the Protennoia in TrimProt CG XIII 40,8 - 41,1.
497. Wisd. 9:17f. The text speaks of the paths of these on earth being corrected (  $\delta\iota\omicron\rho\theta\omicron\upsilon\tau\omicron\theta\alpha\iota$  ).
498. In "The Jewish Background of the Gnostic Sophia Myth", Novum Testamentum XII (1970), pp.86-101, esp. pp.88-94.
499. Cf. Janssens, art.cit., p.416; Schenke, ZRGG 14 (1962), pp.356-61.
500. Cf. the interpretation of Pro- and Epi-noia in Janssens, art.cit., pp.412f., and of Pro- and Epi-Metheus in Zos. On the Letter Omega § 13 (Scott-Ferguson Hermetica IV 107.16-24).
501. Cf. TrimProt CG XIII 39,13 - 40,19.
502. "Die neutestamentliche Christologie", p.213f. Cf. MacRae, "Discourses on the Gnostic Revealer", p.112. MacRae speaks of the Trimorphic Protennoia as "at best only very superficially Christianized" ("The Ego-Proclamation in Gnostic Sources", p.132).
503. Cf. 3StSeth CG VII 120,1 - 121,16(Adamas); 125,11-22; 126,18-31 (Father).
504. Ibid. Böhlig's appeal to the probable Iranian provenance of the motif (on p.90 of his edition of the Apocalypse of Adam) is strained and implausible. Cf. Colpe, Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule, p.164; Schottroff, "Animae naturaliter salvandae", p.82.
505. Cf. the Sethians of Epiph. Pan. XXXIX 1,1 - 3,5; AJ BG 35,20 - 36,7 and parr.; GEgypt CG III 51,5-22 and par.; 56,1-22 and par.; 61,16 - 64,9 and par. However, the conceptions of Seth as heavenly, as father of the immovable race of the Gnostics, and as redeemer occur in apparently non-Christian Gnostic works like 3StSeth (cf. CG VII 118,11ff.; 120,8ff.) and Zostr (cf. CG VIII 6,25ff.; 51,14ff.; 130,14ff.).
506. Pan. XXXIX 3,5 (Holl 2,74.15-20); cf. 1,3 (Holl 2,72.11f.).

507. Cf. Ps. Clem. Hom. III 15,1 (Rehm 61.27ff.); 17,1 (Rehm 62.17-20); 20,1-2 (Rehm 64.1-7). He has as his inferior consort Eve, a figure who recalls the Gnostic Sophia of the Ophites of Irenaeus etc.
508. On the Letter Omega §§ 8, 14-16 (Scott-Ferguson Hermetica IV 106.6-12; 107.25 -109.2).
509. Cf. GEgypt CG III 63,4-8 and par.; ApocAd CG V 69,3-70,6; 74,26-76,3; ParShem CG VII 24,34 - 25,35; 28,11 - 29,33.
510. Cf. AJ CG II 31,3f. and par.; GEgypt CG III 63,10-23 and par.; ApocAd CG V 76,28 - 77,15; ParShem CG VII 31,13 - 32,18; 36,2-24.
511. GEgypt CG III 63,25 - 64,3 and par.
512. Cf. AJ CG II 31,23-5 and par.; GEgypt CG III 63,4 - 68,1 and par.; ApocAd CG V 82,19 - 85,9; ParShem CG VII 30,21-7; 31,9 - 32,18; 36,25 - 38,29; 48,8-30.
513. Cf. E. Preuschen, "Die apokryphen gnostischen Adamschriften" in Festgruss Bernhard Stade, Giessen 1900, esp. no.6, "Über das Evangelium von Seth" (pp.198ff.); Schatzhöhle (tr. Bezold) pp. 8ff.; Book of the Rolls (ed. Gibson) pp.12ff. on the children of Seth; and Jos. Ant. I 2,3; Vit. Adae xlix, 3-1,1; Syncellus Chron. xl; Jub. 8,3; Astrological papyrus Paris. graec. 2419 (cf. Reitzenstein, Poimandres, p.183 n.2) on the two steles of Seth.
514. Cf. e.g. I Apol. 33 where he equates the Spirit and the Word, and I Apol. 6 where he confesses his faith in Father, Son and Spirit.
515. Cf. the attribution to Simon Magus (possibly by Christians or later followers of Simon) of the statement that he appeared among the Jews as Son, in Samaria as Father, and to the rest of the nations as Holy Spirit (Iren. adv.haer. I 23) (Harvey I 191).
516. Cf. the practices of the Carpocratians according to Iren. adv.haer. I 25,6 (Harvey I 210).
517. Cf. the speculations about the three races (spiritual, psychic and choic), three types of Phoenix, and three baptisms (of spirit, fire, and water) in OnOrWld CG II 122,6-16.

## CHAPTER FIVE

Gnostic Eschatology

Can one speak of Gnostic eschatology in the strict sense of a doctrine of the last things? Zandee claims that the Gnostic is not primarily interested in eschatology, in the development of history, but rather in his own inner awakening to true knowledge.<sup>1</sup> Peel sums up the traditional view of Gnostic eschatology as being that the Gnostic "knower", by receiving the saving "gnosis" of who he is, whence he has come and whither he returns, has already obtained in his earthly life the essentials of his eschatological hope.<sup>2</sup> Schweizer asserts that Gnosis does recognise an "eschatology", but not in the sense of a single all-decisive all-perfecting action of God: rather it is determined through the self-discovery of the Gnostic. "Eschatological" means chiefly the release of spirit from matter.<sup>3</sup> The Gnostic thus experiences a kind of "instant" or "realised" eschatology: with his response to the "call" he experiences awakening, resurrection, rebirth. This kind of realised eschatology is expressed in most pregnant form by the statement in the Gospel of Truth: "Since the deficiency came into being because the Father was not known, therefore when the Father is known, from that moment on the deficiency will no longer exist."<sup>4</sup> Or as Irenaeus reports of the Gnostics: "They .... affirm that the resurrection from the dead is no other than the recognition of their so-called truth."<sup>5</sup>

Peel isolates and illustrates four facets of what he calls the

traditional view of Gnostic eschatology.<sup>6</sup> First he alludes to the evident close connection in some Gnostic texts between the reception of baptism and the present realisation of future hopes, which he illustrates from Menander, the revelation discourse in the long version of the Apocryphon, the Marcosian baptismal formula, the Hermetica, the Naassene Exegesis and the Epistle to Rheginus. Secondly he refers to the idea in some texts that, through his reception of the "saving knowledge", the "knower" comes to full realization of his divine nature in the present. This is illustrated from the Gospel of Truth, the Poimandres and the Apocryphon of James from the Jung Codex as well as other works from Nag Hammadi such as the Authoritative Teaching and the Teachings of Silvanus, whose Gnostic character has been questioned.<sup>7</sup> The third facet Peel refers to is the conviction in some texts that the spiritual man, illuminated with "gnosis", has already been transferred to the realm of light. This is illustrated from the Epistle to Rheginus, the Hermetica and the Authoritative Teaching. A final facet is the view in some texts that the Eschaton is felt to have arrived in the present for the Gnostic, which Peel illustrates from the Gospel of Thomas, the Gospel of Truth, and the Dialogue of the Saviour (CG III, 5).

The other major aspect of the traditional view of Gnostic eschatology which Peel notes is the idea that death marks the point

of departure of the "pneuma-self" from the body. He gives detailed evidence of this view in Gnostic sources, without however referring at this point to its presence in modern interpreters.<sup>8</sup> But as he himself goes on to suggest, there must be some final end-goal of the ascent of the "pneuma-self"; apparently the reabsorption of the light-self into its original or into the Godhead. So, even on this view of "present" or "realised" eschatology involving the individual self, there is, implicit or explicit, a universalist, futurist perspective.

Indeed this is admitted by those who most stress the "realised" nature of Gnostic eschatology and sharpen that stress, as Peel puts it, by their existentialist interpretation of Gnostic mythology, such as Jonas and Bultmann.<sup>9</sup> For Jonas, as Schottroff points out, the saving "call" contains the promise of redemption, as a presupposition of final redemption. The Gnostic world view is essentially directed to the future, to the absolute future, that is, it is eschatological.<sup>10</sup> Bultmann too is aware of the futurist aspect. "Gnosticism" he says, "tends to produce an individualistic type of mysticism, in which the redemption, the ascent of the self, is anticipated in meditation and ecstasy."<sup>11</sup> Anticipation, that is, implies a future consummation.

For if there is undoubtedly much support in the Gnostic texts for an eschatology which is seen as present and realised, and which involves the individual "pneuma-self" and its post-mortal ascent,

there is also, as Peel has convincingly demonstrated, equally a considerable body of evidence for a futurist eschatology which is universalist, i.e. involving the whole cosmos and the ultimate restoration of the various mixed elements to their original condition.<sup>12</sup> Peel gives a detailed survey of "Endzeit" speculation,<sup>13</sup> but we might cite examples relevant to our discussion. Thus the Ophites of Irenaeus describe the end as coming (consummationem ..... futuram) when the whole trace of the spirit of light is gathered together and taken up into the Aeon of Imperishability.<sup>14</sup> The Valentinian school of Ptolemaeus refer to the consummation (consummatio: συντελευτης) taking place when the whole spiritual element, the spiritual men who have perfect knowledge, is shaped and perfected in knowledge and enters the Pleroma or bridal chamber.<sup>15</sup> This process is called the restoration (ἀποκαταστάσις) and the goal pictured as eternal rest.<sup>16</sup>

But the question then arises, is this process to be understood as basically atemporal and cyclical so that the endtime coincides with the primal time, as Zandee argues?<sup>17</sup> Or should we, with Haardt, Peel and Foerster, stress the importance of the end-goal of the soteriological process and see this not as cyclical but as unrepeatable, and always related to a concluding Eschaton?<sup>18</sup> Or can we find aspects of both views to some extent combined? Thus there is evidence that some Gnostics believed in the transmigration of souls,



as Peel points out, referring to the Carpocratians of Irenaeus adv. haer. I 25,4, the Apocalypse of Paul (CG V 20, 22f.; 21,17-20) and Celsus' report about the Ophites.<sup>19</sup> As we have seen, the Apocryphon too, or at least the dialogue on the destinies of the souls, appears to envisage a reincarnation of ignorant souls until they acquire knowledge,<sup>20</sup> and the Ophites of Irenaeus seem to believe in a continuous process of souls descending, ascending and redescending into bodies. The holy souls, i.e. those with the trace of light or with knowledge of Christ, are rescued from this cycle by Jesus.<sup>21</sup> This also raises the question posed by John in the Apocryphon: will all the souls be saved, or to the same degree and the same destination, or are there different types and degrees of salvation?

Finally there is the question mark set by Schottroff in a very significant article against any kind of futurist eschatology, even as espoused by Jonas and Bultmann in terms of the post-mortal survival and ascent of the individual soul, or of the ecstatic anticipation of that liberation and ultimate restoration to the heavenly world.<sup>22</sup> She is seeking to answer the question touched on in the previous chapter: when is the time of salvation? Her question applies primarily to the Fourth Gospel, but she finds in Gnosis the closest similarity to and also the basis for the Johannine view that the time of redemption is the time of revelation. Sacramental or eschatological

forms of Gnosis may have existed, but they are to be explained as peripheral phenomena.<sup>23</sup> Her Gnostic evidence for this claim is primarily the revelation discourse at the end of the long recension of the Apocryphon, which, as we have indicated, she considers to be independent of the main body of the Apocryphon and not at all influenced by Christian traditions, although post-Christian.<sup>24</sup>

However, as she insists, she is only concerned with the question of the time of redemption as it relates to Gnosis, and this narrowing down, as we shall see, may well have distorted her view of the Gnostic understanding of redemption, and led her to play down or ignore both the links between the revelation discourse and the rest of the Apocryphon, and the futurist eschatological element in Gnostic theology. Thus Rudolph argues that she has gone too far in explaining sacramental or eschatological Gnosis as peripheral phenomena, and suggests that she is too much under the spell of the Johannine view.<sup>25</sup>

In our analysis of the eschatological ideas of the Apocryphon and of related texts, we shall therefore have to consider whether the eschatology presented is predominantly "realised" or "futurist" or a blend of both; whether it is largely individualist, in terms of the separation of the soul or pneuma-self from the body and its post-mortal ascent, or universalist, in terms of the involvement of the whole cosmos in the restoration process; whether the ultimate redemption involves everyone and to the same degree or destination,

and finally whether the process is cyclical or linear, or one utilising both concepts.

Perhaps one of the most striking features of the Apocryphon, when compared with the Ophite or Valentinian systems described by Irenaeus or other works from Nag Hammadi such as the Untitled Treatise from Codex II, is the apparent paucity of eschatological ideas, apart from the dialogue on the destinies of the souls and the revelation discourse at the end of the long recension. We find no mention of the theme of resurrection or of the syzygy concept of the Gnostic and his angel and their heavenly marriage so central to Valentinianism. What we do find, as we shall see, are various concepts largely corresponding to the various literary strata, but with some attempt to harmonise them. Thus the best procedure in the case of this chapter, unlike that in the preceding ones, would appear to be to analyse the eschatological concepts according to the literary strata or sections, i.e. the frame narrative prologue and epilogue; the central exposition; the dialogue on the destinies of souls, and the closing revelation discourse. In this, however, we shall also draw attention to the links between the various sections.

#### The eschatology of the prologue

The evidently Christian frame story, in the manner customary to Gnostic gospels, relates the appearance to John on a mountain of



The final of a series of questions which John puts to himself as a result of his encounter with the Pharisee: "Of what nature is that aeon to which we shall go?" is also clearly concerned with eschatology and also involves a spatial concept.<sup>34</sup> John's continuation<sup>35</sup> adds further detail: the Saviour said to the disciples that the aeon (to which they would go<sup>36</sup>) has taken on the form (  $\tau\upsilon\pi\omicron\varsigma$  ) of that imperishable aeon, but he did not teach them what it (the latter ?) was like. Now this query not only recalls the disciples' question to the Saviour in the Dialogue of the Saviour (CG III,5): "what is the place (  $\tau\omicron\epsilon\pi\omicron\varsigma$  ) to which we shall go?"<sup>37</sup> with the understandable alternative of 'place' for 'aeon', but the incorruptible aeon occurs as a designation of the supreme heavenly realm and goal of the divine element in man in the Ophite system described by Irenaeus.<sup>38</sup> That the final abode of the elect should come to resemble its archetype in the supreme realm, is a view found in Eugnostos the Blessed with reference both to our aeon coming to be as a type with relation to Immortal Man,<sup>39</sup> and to the Assembly of the three aeons which got its name from the assembly that surpasses heaven.<sup>40</sup>

Furthermore, in the main body of the Apocryphon the Father's aeon is described as imperishable (  $\alpha\tau\tau\alpha\kappa\omicron$  ;  $\alpha\phi\theta\alpha\rho\tau\omicron\varsigma$  ), and as resting in silence.<sup>41</sup> A similar conception also appears to be present in the epilogue where the short recension has the Saviour say: "First I went up to the perfect aeon",<sup>42</sup> and the long: "And

behold now I will go up to the perfect aeon".<sup>43</sup> In all these cases we seem to be dealing with a spatial eschatological concept of the heavenly place or aeon, a concept found both in the frame narrative and in the main body of the work. It is not entirely clear precisely when this ascent is to take place. Thus it might be understood in terms of a post-mortal ascent rather than one at the end of time. But in any case there is a clear future reference with regard to both these concepts of "place" and "aeon", and both are related to the idea of "rest": the souls will be brought to the rest of the aeons; the Father's aeon rests in silence. Rest is, of course, a common metaphor in the Gnostic literature for the eschatological goal and final state of the redeemed.<sup>44</sup>

Finally, we might note details of the Saviour's epiphany and proclamation which have eschatological overtones. As in certain of the apocryphal Acts, Christ appears simultaneously as one and yet as three; as child, old man and youth.<sup>45</sup> As Puech notes, underlying this is the theme of the  $\alpha\iota\omega\acute{\nu}$  (representing past, present and future simultaneously), which could apply to any divine being. Peterson, in the article cited by Puech, finds an explanation of this motif in the apocryphal Acts in Tatian's treatment of time in his Discourse to the Greeks: men believe that time has three forms, past, present and future; but in reality there is only the  $\alpha\iota\omega\acute{\nu}$   $\xi\sigma\tau\omega\varsigma$  46

The Saviour's ~~message~~ also has an eschatological orientation in that he proclaims, echoing Matthew 28:19: "I am with you (plural) always", and asserts that he has come to teach John about the past, present, and future and about the perfect Man.<sup>47</sup> The Saviour repeats his promise to teach about what will happen in the epilogue of the short version,<sup>48</sup> although, as Puech notes, that promise remains unfulfilled.<sup>49</sup> The triple pattern of the promise and the Saviour's continual presence recall the description of the Revealer/Redeemer in the Trimorphic Protennoia as always present in the world and with the elect, and as coming to reveal the past, future and present as respectively Father, Mother, and Son.<sup>50</sup>

Further, the perfect Man motif is in all probability an eschatological one too, involving the reconstitution of the scattered members of the heavenly Primal Anthropos in the consummation. As Schenke has argued, traces of this view of the dismembered fallen Primal Man still survive in the Apocryphon.<sup>51</sup> The whole Naassene Preaching centres on the fall into matter and spiritual regeneration of the creatures of the perfect Man who are consubstantial with him;<sup>52</sup> the Sophia of Jesus Christ has the Saviour relate how he has taught the disciples about the immortal Man and freed him from the fetters of the "robbers" (i.e. the archons);<sup>53</sup> and for the Hypostasis of the Archons and Untitled Treatise from Codex II, the coming of the true Man marks the climax of the redemption of the elect and the judgment



of the archons.<sup>54</sup> However, despite the echoes of the dismembered Primal Man concept in the Apocryphon, the main stress is on the perfect Man as unfallen: as the heavenly image of earthly man, and as ultimately his redeemer. Thus for the Apocryphon the perfect Man is Barbelo, the first Man, appearing to the archons in the image of the primal perfect Man, Adamas,<sup>55</sup> and the Gnostics are those of the immoveable race of the perfect Man.<sup>56</sup> Once again this theme unites the frame narrative and the main exposition and has a future and collective-universalist reference: the Saviour comes to reveal the true nature of the elect resulting from their being in the image of, and of the immoveable race of, the perfect Man with whom presumably they are eventually to be reunited, or to whose heavenly world they are to ascend.

#### The eschatology of the main narrative

Predictably, in view of its content (theogony, cosmogony, and anthropogony) the main exposition has little direct concern with eschatology. However, the passage on the great luminaries and the aeons associated with them as ultimate abodes for the redeemed souls is clearly to be understood as eschatological, and there are also scattered allusions which have a similar reference.

With regard to the four luminaries passage we have drawn attention previously to the secondary identification of Christ with the

Light and of the Autogenes with Christ. What is worth noting here is that the four luminaries derive from the syzygy of two fundamental hypostatised characteristics or offspring of the Father, the Son or Light and Imperishability ( Ἀφθαρσίτης ).<sup>57</sup> The four luminaries are associated with the Autogenes<sup>58</sup> and with the four aeons, each luminary being set over an aeon and having three further aeons associated with it.<sup>59</sup> However, as I have argued above: (1) the abrupt mention of four feminine nouns (grace etc.) whose role in Irenaeus' account of the Barbelognostics and in the Gospel of the Egyptians is clearly to assist or be consorts of the four luminaries;<sup>60</sup> (2) the overlap between these four consorts and the twelve aeons, and the redoubling of their respective relations to the Autogenes, in contrast to the orderly system of the Gospel of the Egyptians (successive ogdoads of luminaries and their consorts, their ministers (Gamaliel etc.) and their consorts (memory etc.));<sup>61</sup> and (3) the evident confusion over the relation of the luminaries to the four aeons, in contrast to the Gospel of the Egyptians (where the four aeons are the product of the Autogenes (Word) and distinct from the four luminaries<sup>62</sup>) or Irenaeus' account of the Barbelognostics (where the aeons do not occur at all), all suggest that the Apocryphon is combining two distinct traditions; one concerned with the four luminaries (and their consorts) who assist the Autogenes; the other involving the four aeons who are begotten by the Autogenes.<sup>63</sup> The

association of the Autogenes and the aeons is confirmed by the rather odd doxology in the Apocryphon where Adamas on being produced praises the Father, the Autogenes, and the aeons; the three, the Father and the Mother and the Son, the perfect power.<sup>64</sup> Here we have the combination of two different hierarchies, one involving the sequence Father, Autogenes, the four aeons and Adamas, the other the sequence Father, Mother, Son.

However, whatever the origin of the various traditions, they are combined by the Apocryphon to suggest that each aeon is conceived of primarily spatially (or spatio-temporally) and as governed by a luminary with whom are associated other aeons conceived as abstract qualities. Furthermore, to each of the first four (spatially conceived) aeons are assigned certain heavenly figures, all with some association with heavenly Man, Adamas. Thus he is set over the first aeon along with the Autogenes Christ with the first luminary Harmozel;<sup>65</sup> his son Seth over the second aeon with the second luminary Oroiael;<sup>66</sup> the offspring ( σπέρμα ) of Seth, the souls of the saints in (or over?) the third aeon for ever with the third luminary, Daueithe;<sup>67</sup> the souls of those who had the saving knowledge but only repented after an interval in the fourth aeon with the fourth luminary, Eleleth.<sup>68</sup>

The whole structure seems to presuppose not one spatio-temporal aeon as the ultimate goal of the perfect Man and his offspring as in

the frame story, but four, apparently in descending order, and associated with four luminaries.<sup>69</sup> What is saved here is the soul, but it can only ascend to the third aeon if it is an elect soul (i.e. the offspring of Seth),<sup>to</sup> or the fourth if it has knowledge and finally repents. These aeons appear to mark the final eternal resting places of the souls, if we accept the short recension's version in the case of the third aeon and luminary. Not all souls therefore appear to be capable of salvation and eternal distinctions remain. There is apparently no ultimate stage beyond the ascent of the soul of the saint to the third aeon and luminary; no final stripping off of the soul by the inner divine element, the spirit, as in Valentinianism; no union with one's consort or the perfect Man in the Pleroma. But, as we have previously indicated, this section has links with the dialogue on the destinies of the various souls at least; both deal with the soul as the object of ultimate salvation and – at least in the short recension –<sup>both see</sup> the goal of the purified soul's ascent to the great lights.<sup>70</sup> Furthermore it may just be possible to detect a parallel between the depiction of Sophia's belated repentance and that of the second group of souls: as she has an aeon to which she will eventually be restored once she has perfected her deficiency,<sup>71</sup> so they will reach at least the fourth aeon once they have repented. Finally the concept of the offspring of heavenly Seth, in association with the four aeon structure as a kind of ladder of perfection, links this section

of the Apocryphon with other works from Nag Hammadi classed as "Sethian", and in particular with Zostrianos from Codex VIII. It appears to envisage the four aeons in association with the Autogenes and the four luminaries as ascending stages in a process of purification and illumination for the initiate or recipient of revelation.<sup>72</sup>

Other eschatological allusions and motifs also occur. There is for example the deficiency/perfection theme we discussed in the previous chapter. Although this does not appear to develop or presuppose the technical and universal role it has in Valentinianism, it has several points of resemblance, and as in Valentinianism, it is related to the destiny of Sophia and of her deficient offspring. Thus her correction of her deficiency is projected as a future event with cosmic significance.<sup>73</sup> The Epinoia is sent out to set man up in his perfection, teach him about the descent of his deficiency and instruct him about his (future) ascent.<sup>74</sup> The archontic prohibition concerning the tree of knowledge is an attempt to prevent man from looking up to his perfection.<sup>75</sup> This may be a reference to his perfect heavenly archetype or to the perfect state attainable by means of saving knowledge, but in either case one cannot wholly rule out a future reference to the heavenly realm which is the final goal. Again, man is taught to eat the knowledge so as to recall this perfection, the result being spatial separation from Ialdabaoth.<sup>76</sup> Perfection would appear to refer here to the original state of man to

which he is eventually to be restored.

Finally, we have the episode of the descent of the Mother's spirit whose purpose, according to the short recension (which we have argued is preferable), is to awaken the substance akin to it according to the type (  $\tau\acute{o}\tau\omicron\varsigma$  ) of perfection (or the Pleroma).<sup>77</sup> The spirit's activity with the seed, we have suggested, parallels on the human level that of the Mother's consort at a prior stage and higher level. This earthly activity finds its consummation with the eschatological descent of the Spirit from the (four?) aeons to raise the seed to the restoration of the aeon (Sophia?) that it (the aeon) become a holy perfection free from deficiency.<sup>78</sup> The restoration and perfection of the heavenly aeon, Sophia, thus depends on that of the Gnostics, and it is perhaps not surprising to find that the long recension is led to speak in Valentinian fashion of the process of restoration of the seed leading to the whole Pleroma becoming holy and free from deficiency.<sup>79</sup>

The main exposition also appears to conceive of a heavenly world composed of aeons, envisaged both as hypostases (e.g. Sophia) and locations, and to have a futurist and collective-universal understanding of eschatology in terms of the ascent of the offspring of Seth to perfect the deficient aeon, Sophia, and ensure her return to her own original location in the heavenly realm. Although every saving event would appear to mark a complete act of redemption,

as Schottroff argues,<sup>80</sup> we must see them in the context of the description of man's plight in terms of successive episodes and must balance the realised element against the evident, if not always so explicit, futurist note. The pervading protological concern of so many Gnostic texts and schools has its natural complement in a corresponding eschatological interest, and the individual post-mortal salvation of the Gnostic is not complete without the redemption of the whole elect seed or race, the dissolution of the original mixture of elements divine and anti-divine, and the reintegration of the heavenly world. That this may be conceived in a naively spatial way in terms of ascent to a heavenly place or aeon does not cancel out its futurist quality, nor does it necessarily imply that one cannot use the term "eschatological" to describe it.

The eschatology of the dialogue concerning the destiny of souls

As we have already suggested, it is no accident that this section of the Apocryphon, which is the one most obviously concerned with eschatology, should follow the mention of the eschatological descent of the Spirit from the aeons, rather than coming, as for example in the Sophia of Jesus Christ, at the end of the doctrinal exposition.<sup>81</sup> It has links with the main narrative, as indicated above, in that, like the passage on the luminaries and aeons, it presents the soul as the object of redemption and envisages the goal of salvation as



light or the great luminaries (at least in the short recension) or as a heavenly place (again at least in BG). This last idea links it with the frame narrative (including both prologue and closing revelation discourse).

The Saviour makes it clear, in answer to John's question whether the souls of everyone will be saved, that salvation is not guaranteed for all. It depends on which spirit descends on the soul or power and unites with it; the spirit of life or the counterfeit spirit. If the former descends on a man he will be saved and become perfect and worthy to ascend.<sup>82</sup> But this involves a future process of purification from every evil and bond of wickedness, which all the versions except BG represent as taking place "there".<sup>83</sup> This might suggest that the luminaries mark the intermediate purificatory stage, the role played by the sun and moon in Manicheism,<sup>84</sup> but from the continuation, which speaks of the elect remaining unscathed by the passions and merely making use of the flesh till they are brought out and taken up by the receivers,<sup>85</sup> "there" must apply to this world. Certainly the similar passage in Book II of the Pistis Sophia envisages the purification of the soul as something which takes place while it is still in the body and in this world, through its discovery of the mysteries.<sup>86</sup>

This future purification process also recalls the undoubtedly eschatological purification of men by God in the Manual of Discipline

( IQS ) from Qumran. It asserts that at the end: "God will cleanse by His truth all the deeds of a man and will refine Him some of the children of men in order to abolish every wicked spirit out of the midst of their flesh; and to cleanse them by a holy spirit from all evil deeds; and He will sprinkle upon him a spirit of truth like purifying water [to cleanse him] from all lying abominations and from defilement by the spirit of impurity".<sup>87</sup>

This process also involves a concern for nothing else apart from the imperishable gathering (short recension:  $\text{C}\omega\sigma\gamma\tau$  i.e.  $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  ?)<sup>88</sup> or imperishability (long recension<sup>89</sup>), which is practised (  $\mu\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu$  ) in complete freedom from passions.<sup>90</sup> The idea of practising one's final state of imperishability as suggested by the long recension makes perfect sense, but the short recension's version has a more authentically Gnostic ring. It hints at the idea that the Gnostics form an earthly  $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ , the copy of the heavenly archetypal  $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ . The concept of the imperishable (  $\acute{\alpha}\phi\theta\alpha\rho\tau\omicron\varsigma$  ) spiritual (  $\piνευματικός$  ) church (  $\epsilon\kappa\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\acute{\iota}\varsigma$  ) occurs in the Gospel of the Egyptians, in connection with the four aeons and four luminaries,<sup>91</sup> and the idea of the elect forming a church here as a type of the heavenly Church of the Pleroma is a common one in Valentinianism.<sup>92</sup>

The description of the reception of the redeemed souls (presumably after they have laid aside the flesh) by the receivers into the dignity

of eternal imperishable life and the calling and of their endurance; completion of the contest; and inheritance of eternal life,<sup>93</sup> has an evident future reference. The receivers figure prominently in the Pistis Sophia, where they serve the archons,<sup>94</sup> but a closer parallel is found in the Gospel of the Egyptians, where they receive the great incorruptible race of Seth and are associated with the heavenly purifiers, gate keepers, and servants of the four luminaries.<sup>95</sup> However, we should note the concentration of echoes of New Testament conceptions and terminology (calling; endurance; completion of the contest; inheritance of eternal life<sup>96</sup>), which might suggest that Christian futurist eschatological conceptions have had some influence on the dialogue section at this point.

The Saviour's answer to a later question from John about where the souls which come out of the flesh (presumably at death) go, in BG's version at least, refers to a superior place, as we have noted.<sup>97</sup> The continuation in all four versions confirms the eschatological nature of this abandonment of the flesh by the soul. Thus the texts relate that the soul escapes from wickedness and through the incorruptible oversight ( ἑπιτελειωσις ; short recension) it is saved and brought up to the repose ( ἀνέπαυσιν ) of the aeons.<sup>98</sup> Such a process might simply be describing the immediate post-mortal salvation of the soul and not its final destiny, but that the latter is

centre of interest is perhaps supported by the fact that "oversight" (ἐπισκοπή; *uṣine*) has its precise equivalent in the Manual of Discipline passage about the two spirits and two destinies, namely *pequddah*. M. Black argues that this term is exactly paralleled by ἐπισκοπή in the New Testament (cf. I Pet 2:12), and that both have the specialized meaning of the Last Visitation of God.<sup>99</sup> Furthermore, although rest or repose could apply to the immediate post-mortual state of the elect soul, it generally has a universal eschatological dimension and describes the final state.<sup>100</sup> The readings of BG 68,12 and CG IV 41,20,<sup>101</sup> if original, reflect the conception of the heavenly rest as taking place among a plural number of aeons regarded as either localities or hypostases (as with the luminary passage and elsewhere in the main narrative), whereas if we prefer CG III 35,1f. and CG II 26,31f.,<sup>102</sup> the rest is represented as eternal (αἰώνιος), a term which parallels Heracleon's description of the goal of salvation.<sup>103</sup> This might be a matter of Valentinian influence on the two versions of the Apocryphon, or perhaps more likely it is either a theme common to both orthodox and Gnostic Christianity from the second century onwards, or a misreading of the Coptic preserved in the other versions. Whichever explanation is preferred, one must admit that the projected goal is future and involves an ascent to a superior heavenly location as with the prologue and the main narrative. There is no hint that such a location

was only an interim one until the consummation, as in Valentinianism.

The Saviour goes on to describe the fate of ignorant souls. They have been overcome by the counterfeit spirit, their soul weighed down and drawn to wickedness and oblivion (  $\beta\omega\epsilon$  ).<sup>104</sup> The short recension then describes how the soul strips itself (of its body, according to CG III),<sup>105</sup> which the long recension in fact seems to presuppose, in that it speaks of it (f., i.e. the soul) coming out.<sup>106</sup> This, of course, clearly refers to the separation of soul and body at death. The former is surrendered to the powers under the archon who again cast it into fetters, and it is led about until it is delivered from oblivion, receives knowledge, becomes perfect thus and is saved.<sup>107</sup> From John's ensuing question: "How does the soul contract and reenter the nature of the mother or the man?",<sup>108</sup> it would appear that the casting into fetters, and into the prison (  $\omega\tau\epsilon\kappa\omicron$  ; long recension<sup>109</sup> ), involves the reincarnation of the soul in another body.<sup>110</sup> In the Pistis Sophia, the soul which has not discovered the mystery of the fetters binding it to the counterfeit spirit is examined by the Virgin of light and given to one of her receivers (  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\lambda\eta\mu\pi\tau\eta\varsigma$  ), who casts it into the body (  $\sigma\omega\mu\alpha$  ) from which it cannot escape until it has completed all the cycles.<sup>111</sup> This is illustrated from Jesus' words in Matt. 5: 25f. about the officer casting the defendant into the prison (  $\omega\tau\epsilon\kappa\omicron$  ).<sup>112</sup>

This idea of cyclical rebirth of the souls appears to be alluded to by the Ophites of Irenaeus when they describe how Jesus enriches himself with holy souls (i.e. those who recognise Christ and Jesus and have the trace of light) once they have laid aside the flesh, thereby diminishing the number the Father has until he will have no more holy souls to send down again (rursus demittat) into the world, but only souls of his own substance.<sup>113</sup> Certainly the followers of Carpocrates, according to Irenaeus, teach an explicit doctrine of the reincarnation of the soul.<sup>114</sup> As the soul of Jesus vanquished the passions, passed through and was set free from all the archontic creators of the world, so too the souls of the Gnostics, having been in every kind of life and action, ascend and are freed. The Carpocratians also quote Mt.5: 25f. as referring to the first of the world creators handing over souls which have not undergone every experience to another angel to shut them up in bodies. "For" as Irenaeus continues, "they say that the body is a prison".<sup>115</sup> Basilides and the Manichees also appear to teach a doctrine of reincarnation,<sup>116</sup> but this is more evidently a matter of metempsychosis or metensomatosis, involving entry into other than purely human bodies, whereas the Apocryphon (if indeed it contains a doctrine of reincarnation), the Pistis Sophia, the Ophites and the Carpocratians do not appear to envisage the latter.

However, although both John's previous questions and the Saviour's replies appear to presuppose a doctrine of reincarnation, and although the Saviour's response to John's question about how the soul contracts to be able to reenter another body compliments John on the perspicacity of his query, the Saviour then goes on to deny that an ignorant soul goes into another flesh ( σάρξ ).

Instead it is attached to another (soul?) in which the spirit of life is, hears through it and is saved.<sup>117</sup> The apparent discrepancy might be resolved by noting that although the soul is not reincarnated in a new body of its own, it has to be linked to a body in order to receive knowledge and be saved. Thus the earlier allusion to being cast into fetters might refer to this rather than to an incorporeal process in an intermediate realm between heaven and earth, as in Manicheism. The version in CG III, perhaps aware of the apparent inconsistency, has attempted, not entirely consistently, to play down or omit references to a reincarnation.<sup>118</sup>

But not all souls are redeemed either immediately after death or eventually; John proceeds to enquire about the fate of those who possessed the saving knowledge but turned away. What will their souls be, or where will they go?<sup>119</sup> The Saviour replies that they will go to the place to which the angels of poverty ( ἀγγέλων τῆς πενίας , i.e. πενίᾳ or πτωχείᾳ ?<sup>120</sup>) will withdraw, for whom there is no repentance (short recension), or the place where there



is no repentance (long recension).<sup>121</sup> Just who these angels are is not clear. Are they the angels of punishment who will withdraw there at the end to inflict eternal torment, or are they the evil angels of the Demiurge who will themselves be punished? The former would fit the long recension better, the latter the short. The mention in the revelation discourse at the end of the long recension of the Saviour urging the redeemed to protect himself from these same angels<sup>122</sup> could apply to either interpretation. Angels of punishment and fallen angels occur as distinct groups side by side in I Enoch,<sup>123</sup> and perhaps as one and the same group (evil angels in charge of punishment) in the Apocalypse of Paul.<sup>124</sup>

The fact that the long recension presents these angels as escorting the souls to their destination<sup>125</sup> and that all four versions continue with a plural conjunctive ("and they guard them")<sup>126</sup> which must refer to the angels, does suggest, however, that the long recension's interpretation of them as angels of punishment is more original. The possibility of repentance is surely more applicable to the souls than, as the short recension suggests, merely to the angels.<sup>127</sup>

Thus, just as the eschatological goal of the redeemed is represented as a location, so is the destination of unrepentant sinners. Further the eschatological perspective of the former is confirmed by the eschatological perspective of the latter. Unrepentant souls, the Saviour asserts, are guarded until the day they will be punished.<sup>128</sup>

Furthermore, in a passage evidently influenced by Matthean eschatology, the Saviour asserts as the climax of this section on the destinies of souls that whoever has blasphemed against the Holy Spirit (cf. Mt. 12: 31f. and parr.) will be tormented in eternal punishment (cf. Mt. 25: 46).<sup>129</sup> By the Holy Spirit the authors must mean the eschatological Spirit of life from the holy aeons.

Whatever its provenance, the dialogue on the destinies of the souls is linked to the frame narrative and main exposition by certain eschatological motifs, particularly the spatial concept of the heavenly goal, but also the idea of the spirit of life descending and uniting with the soul or power. Its focus on the soul as the object of salvation also links it to the passage on the luminaries. However, it betrays no sign of the idea that there are distinctions in heaven among the redeemed. Although salvation seems to occur with the separation of the soul from the flesh or body after death, the dialogue betrays a variety of conceptions that point to a futurist collective-universal view (e.g. imperishable gathering; oversight; rest of the aeons) which has its counterpart in the future day of punishment for apostate souls. The very qualified belief in reincarnation suggests the irreversible character of the process of redemption: a cyclical pattern (as in the *Pistis Sophia*) is ruled out since the soul can apparently only have one body of its own. There is evidence of influence from sectarian Judaism and from the New Testament and

parallels with second and third century Christian eschatology, second century Gnostics like Carpocrates and Basilides and third century Gnostic works like the Pistis Sophia. There are echoes of Valentinus' view about the soul and of Heracleon's language about the eternal rest, but in general this section seems independent of, and unlikely to have influenced, the specifically Valentinian view of eschatology.

#### The eschatology of the revelation discourse

As I argued in the previous chapter, the revelation discourse, if not an original part of the Apocryphon, is inextricably linked with the presentation of Christ in the prologue and clearly associated with the present description of Barbelo in the main narrative. It also seems best to assume that the short recension found it in its Vorlage but, misunderstanding the association, reinterpreted and drastically pruned it. Thus its reference to the Father-Mother taking form in her offspring<sup>130</sup> probably represents its attempt to recast the Pro-noia's statement that she transformed herself in her offspring.<sup>131</sup> Thus any attempt to understand this along the lines of Valentinian eschatology, of Sophia Achamoth being formed in and through the formation of her spiritual offspring, such as Arai has suggested,<sup>132</sup> must be seen as secondary. The Saviour's following statement in the short recension that he first ascended to the perfect aeon,<sup>133</sup>

should likewise be understood, we have argued, as a modification of his assertion in the long that he was about to ascend.<sup>134</sup> This is therefore a reference, not to some supposed ascent of the Saviour after his "resurrection", but to his Ascension, and thus eschatological. It also, of course, harmonises with the prologue's conception of the eschatological goal as a single heavenly location, the perfect aeon.<sup>135</sup>

The triple descent scheme of the discourse has certain eschatological features too. Thus the Revealer/Redeemer describes himself as the remembrance of the Pleroma, representing the original heavenly perfection which is the goal of the Gnostic.<sup>136</sup> We might compare this with the figure of Jesus, the Saviour, in Valentinianism, who is the star and fruit of the Pleroma, and whose correction and perfection of Achamoth is the archetype of his redemption of the Gnostics.<sup>137</sup> Again the Revealer/Redeemer of the revelation discourse, in describing his second descent, speaks of being concerned with his plan ( οἶκος νεμεία ) and of reascending lest the underworld (i.e. this world) be destroyed before the time ( οὐροειας , i.e. κρισις ? )<sup>138</sup>. Both concepts suggest progress towards a final goal, the salvation of the elect and the destruction of the cosmos. Again, in describing his third descent the Saviour speaks of filling his countenance ( ρο ) with the light of the consummation ( συντελεια ) of their aeon.<sup>139</sup> However we interpret this obscure statement, it

must have a universal-eschatological connotation; the Saviour descends aglow with the brilliance of heaven, a brilliance which marks the end of the present age and world governed by the archons through their creation, Fate ( *ἑξαρμύνη* ). In Johannine language this is the light which the darkness could not comprehend (cf. Jn.1:5).<sup>140</sup>

The Saviour goes on to describe himself to the awakened Gnostic as the one who raises him up to the honoured place,<sup>141</sup> which again appears to represent the spatial concept of the ~~sterio~~-eschatological goal as found throughout the Apocryphon, although Schottroff argues that this is not tied to some temporal future or distinguished from the Gnostic's hearing the call.<sup>142</sup> The Gnostic is further urged to protect himself from the angels of poverty and demons of chaos and is sealed with the five seals by the Saviour to prevent death having power over him any longer.<sup>143</sup> Schottroff argues that these concepts, change of location and victory over death, are mythological ones intended to enlarge or expand the existential act of hearing which is the essence of redemption for this passage.<sup>144</sup> That such an existential interpretation is demanded is shown, she argues, by the fact that one cannot logically unite the two concepts into a common mythological scheme.<sup>145</sup>

However, the evident links as regards theological, cosmological, and eschatological details between the revelation discourse

and the rest of the Apocryphon (e.g. the figure of the Revealer/ Redeemer, the description of the Gnostic, the angels of poverty, the honoured place and perfect aeon), which Schottroff disregards, suggest that this section of the Apocryphon should not be considered in isolation. It has been put here on purpose, and attempts have been made, especially by the long recension, to integrate it further. In the light of the evident future-eschatological tenor of the other sections of the work, we should not overlook the pointers in that direction which occur in the revelation discourse. Furthermore, the concepts of change of place and of victory over death need not be incompatible. If the latter presupposes continued existence in this world, the realm of death, the former may simply apply to the Saviour's exhortation to the prone Gnostic to raise himself upright.<sup>146</sup> The latter motif certainly does not rule out a future-eschatological perspective which would involve not simply continued protection from the power of death but total removal from that situation, and the former motif does not exclude a future ascent to the heavenly place and aeon.

Peel would interpret the Redeemer's sealing the awakened Gnostic with the five seals as a baptismal formula which expresses the consummation of the process of salvation and is thus an example of sacramentally realised eschatology.<sup>147</sup> But one has to ask first; is this an actual sacrament? Secondly, does it rule out a final ascent

from the whole realm of death? Certainly the parallel passage in the Trimorphic Protennoia dealing with the third descent of the Redeemer/Revealer represents her as initiating the elect into various rituals at the hands of heavenly beings (stripping; robing; baptism; enthronement; glorification; being snatched away into the light realm of the Fatherhood; receiving the five seals), which suggests a future heavenly rather than present earthly process.<sup>148</sup> A similar sacramental type of passage dealing with the five seals in the Gospel of the Egyptians also suggests a future heavenly goal: those who from now on are worthy of the invocation (  $\epsilon\pi\acute{\iota}\kappa\lambda\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$  ) and of the renunciation (  $\alpha\pi\acute{o}\tau\alpha\epsilon\iota\varsigma$  ) of (i.e. involved in?) the five seals in the spring baptism, will know their (heavenly) receivers (  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha\lambda\gamma\mu\acute{\iota}\tau\omega\varsigma$  ) as they are instructed about them, and they will know (or be known by) them. These will by no means taste death.<sup>149</sup> All these passages may reflect an actual sacrament or a mystical ascent and ecstatic anticipation of future bliss, but none of them rule out the future consummation; rather they point to it.

### Conclusion

Thus in answer to the questions posed at the beginning of the chapter we would argue that although there are passages in the Apocryphon which point to a realised eschatology in mystical or sacramental or even existentialist terms, they are balanced and indeed outnumbered by those with a futurist-universal perspective.



Certain concepts and presuppositions appear to unite the various sections of the work, such as the spatio-temporal concept of the eschatological goal (the heavenly place or aeon), or the collective concept of the Perfect Man. The latter thus suggests that although the stress is on the salvation of the individual, and in certain passages, of his soul only, there is also a universalist strain which is also reflected in the concepts of the race or the seed of the elect.

As regards the question of degrees of salvation, the dialogue on the destinies of the souls and the allied passage on the luminaries suggest that only the soul is saved. That there will be an eternal distinction between the souls of the saints, which remain in the third aeon, and the souls which finally repent and only reach the fourth aeon, appears to be the message of the latter passage. The former, although distinguishing souls on whom the spirit of life descends and whose knowledge and ascetic practice ensures immediate post-mortel redemption, and souls who are ignorant and only saved after union with other incarnate souls, does not appear to teach an ultimate distinction between them.

On the question of whether the Apocryphon or its constituent parts has a cyclical rather than a linear view or vice versa, we noted that elements in the main narrative and particularly the dialogue on the destinies of souls suggest an irreversible movement towards a

future goal. Thus although a doctrine of reincarnation appears to be hinted at, it is drastically qualified and weakened. Souls do not reenter another flesh. The ultimate distinction suggested by the luminaries passage also argues against the return of everything to some original unity.

As one might expect, there are echoes of the eschatological terminology of other Gnostic schools and documents. Thus the Apocryphon shares the ideas of the imperishable aeon, of the holy souls as subjects of salvation, of a limited kind of reincarnation with the Ophites of Irenaeus; the ideas of rest, the Pleroma, visitation, and the consummation with the Valentinians; and the general understanding of the purification and punishment of souls with the Pistis Sophia. We noted the evident influence of Jewish sectarian ideas, although perhaps not at first hand, on the dialogue on the destinies of souls which also, like the frame narrative, betrays evidence of Christian influence. But the work is clearly independent of all these, betraying no trace of the central role of the heavenly figure of Christ and his union with and raising up of Jesus in the Ophite system, or of the fundamental Valentinian motif of the syzygy of the Gnostic and his angel and their union in the bridal chamber. Nor is there much sign of the apocalyptic imagery so dear to other similar works from Nag Hammadi such as the Untitled Treatise from Codex II or the Trimorphic Protennoia. If

the Apocryphon did influence the origin and development of Valentinianism, it was evidently not in the field of eschatology.

But in this area too, as with soteriology with which it is inextricably intertwined, we meet once more the tension and paradox of the Gnostic dilemma; their assurance of salvation and future bliss as somehow already present (hence the genuine presence and possibility of "realised eschatology" in Gnostic texts) and yet their awareness that that bliss, that salvation, would only be complete when all the elect were freed from this world of evil and oblivion. The "Now" and the "Not Yet" remain in indissoluble antithesis. Thus we cannot accept Schottroff's interpretation of futurist eschatology in the Apocryphon and other Gnostic texts as peripheral.

Notes to Chapter 5

1. J.Zandee, "Gnostische Eschatologie", in X Internationaler Kongress für Religionsgeschichte, 11-17 September 1960, in Marburg, Marburg 1961, p.94.
2. M.L. Peel, "Gnostic Eschatology and the New Testament", Novum Testamentum XII (1970), p.143.
3. E. Schweizer, "Gegenwart des Geistes und eschatologische Hoffnung bei Zarathustra, spätjüdischen Gruppen, Gnostikern und den Zeugen des neuen Testaments" in The Background of the New Testament and its Eschatology (Studies in honour of C.H. Dodd), Cambridge 1956, pp. 500f.
4. GTr CG I 24, 28-32.
5. Adv.Haer. II, 31, 2 (Harvey I 370).
6. Art.cit., pp.150-3.
7. On the Authoritative Teaching see now R. van der Broek, "The Authentikos Logos: A New Document of Christian Platonism", Vig.Chr. 33 (1979), pp.260-86; on Silvanus see now the introduction by M.L. Peel and J.Zandee to the English translation in The Nag Hammadi Library in English, p.346.
8. Ibid., pp.153-5. For modern support for this cf. e.g. R.Bultmann, Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting, London 1962, pp.200f.
9. Ibid., p.145.
10. L.Schottroff, "Heil als innerweltliche Entweltlichung: Der gnostische Hintergrund der johanneischen Vorstellung vom Zeitpunkt der Erlösung", Novum Testamentum XI (1969), pp.294-317, and esp. pp.311f. (referring to Jonas, Gnosis, vol. I, p.127; II 1,p.11).
11. Op.cit.,p.203.
12. Art.cit., pp.155-162.
13. Ibid., pp.155-9.

14. Adv. haer. I 30,14 (Harvey I 241). On the Aeon of Imperishability cf. AJ BG 20,15; 26,6f. and parr.; Apoc Ad CG V 74,2; De Res CG I 45,18.
15. Cf. Adv. haer. I 6,1 (Harvey I 53); 7,1 (Harvey I 58f.); Exc. ex Theod. 62,2 - 65,2 (Sagnard 182-8).
16. On ἀποκατάστασις cf. Iren. adv. haer. I 8,4 (Harvey I 75); 14,1 (Harvey I 131); 21,3 (Harvey I 184); Heracleon frag. 34 on Jn.4: 36 in Orig. Comm in Joh. XIII 46; De Res CG I 44,31; TriTrac CG I 123, 19.21.27; 133,7; GPh CG II 67,18. Cf. Basilides in Hipp. Ref. VII 26,2 (Wendland 204.10); 27,4.11 (Wendland 206.19; 207.29). On rest as an eschatological rather than simply a post-mortal phenomenon cf. AJ BG 26, 7ff.; 68, 12ff. and parr.; Heracleon frags. 12; 32-34; 42; GTr CG I 40,30-41,14; GPh CG II 66,19; Th Cont CG II 145,13 etc.
17. Art.cit., p.95 ("Die Endzeit fällt zusammen mit der Urzeit"). Zandee quotes (without identifying) TriTrac CG I 79,1f.; 127,23f. ("that the end should be as the beginning").
18. M.L. Peel, art.cit., p.159, quoting with approval the view of R. Haardt, "Das universaleschatologische Vorstellungsgut in der Gnosis", Vom Messias zum Christos: Die Fülle der Zeit in religionsgeschichtlicher und theologischer Sicht (ed.K. Schubert), Vienna 1964, p.331. Cf. W.Foerster's introduction to Gnosis vol.I, p.7. See on this K. Rudolph, ThR 36(1971), p.28.
19. Ibid., p.155. Peel wrongly ascribes Celsus' report to adv. haer. I 6, 24-38. The correct reference is of course Orig. c. Cels. VI 24-38, and in particular 33-36.
20. Cf. AJ BG 68, 13-70,8; CG III 35,2-36,3; CG II 26,32-27,21; CG IV 41,10-42,23.
21. Cf. Iren. adv. haer. I 30,14 (Harvey I 240: ut rursus (the Demiurge) demittat eas (the holy souls) in saeculum, tantum eas quae sunt ex substantia ejus).
22. Art.cit., esp. pp.303,311,315f.
23. Ibid., pp.315ff.
24. Ibid., p.304.

25. K. Rudolph, *ibid.*, p.29.
26. On the structure of the Apocryphon as that of the classic Gnostic gospels and its introduction as in full conformity to the rules of this literary genre, see H.-C. Puech, "Gnostic Gospels and Related Documents", Hennecke-Schneemelcher, *N.T. Apocrypha I*, pp.320f.
27. AJ BG 19,15f.; CG II 1, 11f.
28. Cf. Jn,7: 33f.; 13: 3; 16: 5.28.
29. Cf. Ev.Petri 56; Tert. adv.Jud. 13.
30. Apocry Jas CG I 2, 23-5; 14,20-2. In both cases the text has τοπος.
31. Epistula Jacobi Apocrypha (eds. Malina, Puech, Quispel, Till, Kasser, adiuvantibus Wilson, Zandee), Zürich/Stuttgart 1968, p.41. Puech cites Iren.adv.haer. I 21, 5; 1 Apoc Jas CG V 34,17f.; Apoc Paul CG V 23,9f.; Epiph. Pan. XL 2,8; Turfan Manichean fragment M4.
32. BG 67, 18-68, 13. However there is no mention of a 'place' in the other three versions at this point, although one might expect it, in view of John's question.
33. CG II 31, 13f.; CG IV 48, 17f.
34. BG 20, 12-14; CG II 1, 24f.
35. BG 20, 14-18; CG II 1, 26-9.
36. CG II, 1, 25 reads thus according to Krause's reconstruction. He suggests that BG 20, 14f. may have omitted it through homoeoteleuton.
37. Dial Sot CG III 142,16f.
38. Adv.haer. I 30, 2 (Harvey I 228); 30,11 (Harvey I 238); 30,13 (Harvey I 239); 30,14 (Harvey I 241). Cf. De Res CG I 45,18 (Jesus transformed himself into an imperishable aeon); Apoc Ad CG V 74,2 (their great aeon(s?) of imperishability).

39. Cf. Eug CG III 83, 20-2.
40. Cf. Eug CG III 86, 16-24.
41. Cf. BG 26, 6-9 ( Ἀττακο ); CG III 6, 19-21 ( Ἀφθερτος ); CG II 4, 10-13; CG IV 6, 10-13 ( Ἀττακο ).
42. BG 75, 14f.; CG III 39, 13f.
43. CG II 31, 25-27; CG IV 49, 6-8.
44. Cf. e.g. the index to Foerster, *Gnosis II*, Oxford 1974, s.v. rest, repose, and On Or Wld CG II 125, 8f.; G Egypt CG III 65, 4. See on this P. Vielhauer, "ANATTAYCK: zum gnostischen Hintergrund des Thomas evangeliums", in *Apophoreta* (BZNW 30) Berlin 1964, 281-99.
45. Cf. BG 21, 3-13; CG II 2, 1-9. Here BG and CG II diverge but CG II's version seems preferable since it has all three mentioned whereas BG 21, 4-6 only mentions the child and the old man (yet speaks in 13f. of three forms). On the παλαιορφός Christ cf. *Acta Petri*, ch. 20f.; *Acta Johannis*, chs. 73, 88; *Acta Pauli*, in Hamburg papyrus p. 3; *Acta Andree et Matthiae*, ch. 18. See on this Puech in Hennecke-Schneemelcher, I, p. 321 n. 1. There he refers to E. Peterson, "Einige Bemerkungen zum Hamburger Papyrus-fragment der *Acta Pauli*", *Vig. Chr.* 3 (1949), pp. 149-59. *Pistis Sophia*, Book I ch. 4 (Schmidt-MacDermot 7.13-8.2) speaks of the three light forms in which Christ appeared.
46. Peterson, *ibid.*, p. 158.
47. BG 21, 18-22, 9; CG II 2, 12-20; CG IV 3, 5-16.
48. BG 76, 5f.; CG III 39, 21f. Here the reference is to "you" in the plural (i.e. the disciples?) and not, as one might have expected, to the singular (i.e. John).
49. *Op.cit.*, p. 327. The English translation obscures Puech's allusion to the unexpected plural referred to in the previous note.
50. Cf. e.g. Trim Prot CG XIII 35, 1-20; 40, 29-42, 2; 42, 17-45, 2; 47, 10-50, 20.
51. "Die neutestamentliche Christologie", p. 216. He cites BG 53, 6f. and parr.; 55, 13f. and parr.



52. Cf. Hipp. Ref. V 7,7f. ( Wendland 80,10-19) etc.
53. Cf.SJC BG 120,13-121,17.
54. Cf. Nat Arch CG II 96, 33f.; On Or Wld CG II 123,23-127,17.
55. Cf. BG 27,19.f and parr.; 35,3f. and parr.; 49,2-6 and parr.
56. BG 22, 14-16; CG II 2,23-5; CG IV 3, 20f.; BG 71,12f.; CG III 36,25-37,1.
57. BG 32, 19-33, 2 and parr. Cf. Iren. adv.haer. I 29,2 (Harvey I 223); Melch CG IX 6, 2-5.
58. BG 33, 2ff. and parr. Cf. Iren adv.haer. I 29, 2 (Harvey I 223 ) G Egypt CG III 52,3-16.
59. BG 33, 5-34, 15 and parr.
60. Adv.haer. I 29,2 (Harvey I 223: ad subministrationem quatuor luminaribus); G Egypt CG III 52,6-16 and par.
61. G Egypt CG III 51,17-53,12 and par.
62. G Egypt CG IV 60,1-21. Cf. CG III 50,23 where the Autogenes Word and Adamas ask for a power and eternal strength for the Autogenes as a completion (  $\pi \lambda \acute{\iota} \rho \omega \mu \alpha$  ) for the four aeons, and the four luminaries and Seth are produced.
63. For the link of Christ with the four luminaries cf. Melch CG IX 6,2-5; for the Autogenes as begetter of four aeons within him cf. Zostr CG VIII 19,6-12; 127,14-19; Trim Prot CG XIII 38,16-39,8. In Zostr the four lights are distinct, but are set over the four aeons, as in the Apocryphon (cf. 29,1-21; 127,19-128,7). In Trim Prot the aeons are given the names of the four lights (38,33-39, 5) but the lights are clearly distinct (cf. 39,14f. which has the Great Light Eleleth speak). The Untitled Text in the Bruce Codex mentions in ch.20 the twelve aeons, the Autogenes aeon, and the four luminaries together (Schmidt-MacDermot NHS XIII 264.2,4-6). See above pp. 93ff.
64. BG 35,17-20 and parr. See above p. 101f.
65. BG 35,6-10 and parr. cf. G Egypt CG III 65,12-15 and par.

66. CG II 9, 11-14. This is preferable to BG 35,20-36,2 which omits the second aeon and CG III 13,17-19 which has Seth in rather than over the second aeon. Cf. G Egypt CG III 65, 16-18 and par.
67. CG III 13,19-14,1. This seems preferable to BG 36,2-7, which has the souls in the third luminary, and CG II 9,14-17, which has them over the third luminary. Cf. G Egypt CG III 65,19f. and par. (the third luminary, Daueithe, the place in which the sons of Seth rest); Zostr CG VIII 7,1-9 (the sons of Seth in the third aeon?).
68. BG 36,7-15 and parr. All three surviving texts diverge over their fate; BG 36,14f. has Eleleth bind them to him; CG III 14,7f. has them gathering (  $\text{C}\text{O}\text{O}\text{Y}\text{Z}$  ;  $\text{C}\text{O}\text{O}\text{Y}\text{Z}$  ? ) to that place; CG II 9,23 says that these are the creatures who honour the invisible Spirit. Cf. G Egypt CG III 65,20-2 (the souls of the sons resting in the fourth luminary); Zostr CG VIII 6, 19-25 (the souls in the fourth aeon).
69. Cf. Zostr CG VIII, 6,7-7,22; 29,1-20. In G Egypt CG III 65,12-22 the third luminary is the place of the sons of Seth and the fourth of their souls, suggesting the Valentinian distinction between the spiritual element which enters the Pleroma and the soul which remains in the Ogdoad, cf. CG III 65,7 which speaks of "the souls of the elect". But CG IV 76,27 has "the slain souls". Böhlig-Wisse, The Gospel of the Egyptians, p.196, suggest the difference may derive from variant understandings of  $\text{C}\text{O}\text{O}\text{Y}\text{Z}$ .
70. Cf. BG 33,1f.; CG III 11,17 and BG 65,7f.; CG III 33,6f.
71. Cf. BG 46, 9-47,13 and parr.
72. Cf. Zostr CG VIII 6,7-7, 22; 29,1-20.
73. Cf. BG 47,4-14 and parr.
74. BG 53, 4-18; CG III 25,6-17; CG II 20,14-24.
75. BG 57,8-19 and parr. CG II 22,7 reads  $\text{C}\text{O}\text{O}\text{Y}\text{Z}$ .
76. BG 61,2-9; CG III 30,18-23. CG III 30,20 reads  $\text{C}\text{O}\text{O}\text{Y}\text{Z}$ .
77. BG 63,14-64,3; CG III 32,8-14.

78. BG 64, 3-13; CG III 32,14-22.
79. CG II 25,12-16; CG IV 39,10-15.
80. Der Glaubende, pp.9f.; 97-99. Her argument perhaps carries more weight in the case of the saving episode where Adam's thought is awakened, and he is said to have entered the light, cf. BG 52,11-15; CG III 24,20-23. But the long recension at this point simply describes Adam as shining (CG II 20,6), which doesn't have the same note of finality.
81. Cf. SJC BG 122,5-125,10. See above p. 450.
82. BG 65,3-8. CG III 33,4-7 omits the reference to ascent which must surely be presupposed. CG II 25,26 and CG IV 39,29f. speak of becoming worthy of greatnesses, a term which in Valentinianism refers in the plural to the angels of the Pleroma, cf. Iren. adv. haer. I 13,6 (Harvey I 124f.). Cf. also the plural use in Eug CG III 86,5f. = SJC BG 109,16.
83. CG III 33,7-9; CG II 25,27f.; CG IV 39,30-40,3. BG 65,9 has ΝΜΜΔΥ, i.e. "with them", which might be a mistake for ΜΜΔΥ. The other texts have ΕΤΜΜΔΥ.
84. Cf. e.g. Acta Archelai VIII, 5f. (Beeson GCS 16, 12.13-13.8); Psalm Book Ps. CCXXIII (C.R.C. Allberry, A Manichaean Psalm-Book: Part II, Stuttgart 1938, 10.30-2 = Adam, Texte<sup>2</sup>, Berlin 1969, 41.63ff.); Alexander of Lycopolis, c. Manich. op. disp. (Brinkmann 6.19-7.6 = Adam, *ibid.*, 55.57-56.11); Fihrist (trans. Flügel pp.87-90 = Adam, *ibid.*, 123.228-43).
85. BG 65, 11-66,6; CG III 33,9-18; CG II 25,29-26,1; CG IV 40,3-13.
86. PS ch.100 (Schmidt-MacDermot 249.20-252.12). However, Till on p.171 his edition of BG supposes that "there" applies to the great lights.
87. IQS iv.20f. I am quoting the translation by M. Black in The Scrolls and Christian Origins, Edinburgh/London 1961, p.133.
88. BG 65,11-13; CG III 33,9-11. Crum, Dictionary 373b, gives ἐκκλήσις as the second of the main meanings κωοϋς stands for.
89. CG II 25,29f.; CG IV 40,3-5.

90. BG 65,15-17; CG III 33,12-14; CG II 25,31-3; CG IV 40,5-7.
91. GEgypt CG III 55,2-5 and parr.
92. Cf. e.g. Iren. adv.haer. I 5,6 (Harvey I 51); TriTrac CG I 97,6ff.
93. BG 66,1-13; CG III 33,16-23; CG II 25,35 - 26,7; CG IV 40,10-20. Cf. II Thess. 1:11; I Cor. 13:7; II Tim. 4:7; Matt. 19:29 and parr. See n. 96.
94. Cf. e.g. P<sup>S</sup> Book II, ch.103 (Schmidt-MacDermot, 262.7 - 264.13).
95. GEgypt CG III 64,22ff. and par. Cf. CG III 66,5 and par.
96. On being worthy of the call, cf. II Thess 1:11; on enduring (ἐπιμένειν) everything, cf. I Cor. 13:7; on completing the contest (ἀθλῶν), cf. II Tim. 4:7; on inheriting eternal life, cf. Matt. 19:29 and parr.
97. BG 67, 18-68,7; CG III 34,18-23; CG II 26,22-27; CG IV 41, 10-16.
98. BG 68,7-13; CG III 34,23 - 35,2; CG II 26,28-32; CG IV 41, 16-20.
99. Op.cit., p.135,cf. IQS iii.18; iv.6.12.18-23. On ἐπισκοπή as meaning God's gracious care, cf. Wisd. 2:20; 3:7; 3:13 (plus ψυχαί) etc. However, the visitation (ἐπισκοπή) of the repentant Logos by his brothers in TriTrac CG I 90,24; 91,10 is not eschatological.
100. See note 44.
101. ΤῶΝ ἈΠΛΥΓΙΩΝ ἸΝΔΙΩΝ
102. ΤῶΝ ἈΠΛΥΓΙΩΝ ἸΝΔΙΩΝ
103. Cf. frag. 42 on Jn. 8:20 in Orig. Comm. in Joh. XIX 19. The Jews believe they themselves will depart to God to ἀναστῆναι ἑαυτοὺς ἑωυτοῖς.
104. BG 68,13- 69,5; CG III 35,2-10; CG II 26,32 - 27,4; CG IV 41,21 - 42,1.
105. BG 69, 5f.; CG III 35, 10f.

106. CG II 27,3f.; CG IV 42,1f.
107. BG 69,6-13; CG III 35,11-18; CG II 27,5-11; CG IV 42,2-10.
108. BG 69,14-18; CG III 35,18-22; CG II 27,11-14; CG IV 42,11-15.
109. CG II 27,7f.; CG IV 42,5f.
110. On the fetter of the material body cf. e.g. BG 55,9-13 and parr.; on the prison of the body, cf. e.g. CG II 31,3f. Although CG III 35,14 avoids the idea by reading "other places" ( *ἄλλοι τόποι* ) instead of "fetter", it admits it by reading *παλιν* at 1.20. However, the long recension's reading: "its (the soul's) mother (CG II 27,14; CG IV 42,14)", suggests that it understood the Mother and the Man to refer to the soul's eschatological union with its progenitors, Sophia and her consort, First Man. But the Saviour's reply presupposes reincarnation rather than eschatological reunion, and therefore the short recension's reading may be preferable.
111. PS Book III, ch.113 (Schmidt-MacDermot,294.15 - 296.3). Cf. Book IV, chs. 144-7 (Schmidt-MacDermot, 374.6 - 383.11).
112. Ibid. (Schmidt-MacDermot,295.4-11). Cf. ApocPaul CG V 20,5 - 21,22.
113. Iren. adv.haer. I 30,14 (Harvey I 240).
114. Cf. adv.haer. I 25,1-4 (Harvey I 204-9). The Latin (ibid., p.209) has de corpore in corpus transmigrantes, and the Greek of Hippolytus (Ref. VII 32,2f.: Wendland 220.2.7) *μετενσώμαται τοῖς σῶματι*.
115. Ibid., I 25,4 (Harvey I 208f.).
116. On Basilides cf. fragment 4 in Clem. Alex. Strom. IV 12,83,1; frag. 5 in Orig. In Rom. V 1. On the Manichees cf. Acta Archelai X, 1-8 (Beeson 15.6 - 17.13).
117. BG 69,18 - 70,8; CG III 35,22 - 36,4; CG II 27,14-21; CG IV 42,15-23. For this interpretation see Giversen, Apocryphon, pp.266f.

118. Thus at 35,14 it alters "fetters" of BG 69,15f. into "other places", and at 36,3 reads "flesh" instead of the "another flesh" of BG 70,8, but fails to omit the tell-tale "again (  $\pi\alpha\lambda\iota\varsigma$  )" of 35,13 and 20.
119. BG 70,8-11; CG III 36,4-7; CG II 27,21-4; CG IV 42,24-7. BG 70,11 simply has: "what are they?", but, as Till argues (p.181 of his edition), the second question: "where will they go" must surely be original since BG has the answer to it.
120. Cf. Crum , Dictionary 664 a (  $\tau\kappa\theta$  ). In On Or Wld CG II 110,12f. mention is made of those souls becoming immortal which come out of the creaturely forms (  $\pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\sigma\mu\alpha$  ) of poverty (  $\mu\tilde{\nu}\tau\tau\epsilon\kappa\epsilon$  ) at the consummation.
121. BG 70,11-15; CG III 36,7-10; CG II 27,24-7; CG IV 42,27-43,1.
122. Cf. CG II 31,17f.; CG IV 48,23f.
123. Cf. I Enoch 53,3; 54,6 etc.
124. Cf. Apoc. Paul. 11;14-18; 44.
125. CG II 27,26; CG IV 42,30f.
126. BG 70,16; CG III 36,10; CG II 27,27f.; CG IV 43,2.
127. On the themes of the two rival spirits in man, and the possibility or not of repentance cf. Hermas Vis. II, ii ; Mand. V - VII.
128. BG 70,16-18; CG III 36,10-12; CG II 27,27-9; CG IV 43,2f.
129. BG 70,18-71,2; CG III 36,12-15; CG II 27,29-31; CG IV 43, 3-6. Cf. Rev.20: 10 where the Devil and others will be tormented (  $\beta\alpha\sigma\iota\lambda\epsilon\iota\sigma\theta\acute{\iota}\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$  ) day and night for ever and II Clem.17,7 where those who denied Jesus are punished (  $\kappa\omicron\lambda\acute{\alpha}\zeta\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$  ) with terrible torments (  $\beta\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\nu\omicron\varsigma$  ).
130. BG 75,10-13; CG III 39,11-13.
131. CG II 30,13; CG IV 46,25f. See above pp. 480f.
132. S.Arai, NTS 15 (1968/69), pp.309ff.

133. BG 75,14f.; CG III 39,13f.
134. CG II 31,25-7; CG IV 49,6-8.
135. Cf. BG 20,12-19; CG II 1,24-9, etc.
136. CG II 30,16; CG IV 47,1f.
137. Cf. Iren adv. haer. I 2,6 (Harvey I 23); Hipp. Ref. VI 32,1f. (Wendland 159.26 - 160.9); Tri Trac CG I 86,24-87,24.
138. CG II,30,21-32; CG IV 47,8-22. In Eph. 1:10, 3:2 and 3:9 οἰκονομία has an evident soterio-eschatological connotation, and 1:10 speaks of the οἰκονομία of the fulfilment (πλήρωμα) of the times (καίρος). On οὐοείω as a Coptic translation of καίρος cf. Crum, Dictionary 499b - 500a. On the eschatological sense of καίρος in the NT cf. Lk.21:8; Rev. 1:3; 22:10; Mk.1:15; 13:33. On πρὸ καίρου cf. Matt. 8:29; I Cor. 4:5.
139. CG II 31,1f.; CG IV 47,29-48,2.
140. Cf. the use of the phrase "consummation of the aeon" in OnOrWld CG II 110,13; 114,24; 121,26; 122,6.7f.; 122,33; 123,30; 125,32f.; G Egypt CG III 61,3; 62,21 and par. Trim Prot CG XIII 44,33f. On the light surrounding the Saviour as a characteristic of his appearance cf. PS Book . I chs. 4 - 6 (Schmidt-MacDermot,7.5-25; 8.8-13); chs. 11-15 (Schmidt-MacDermot,20.12 - 25.3).
141. CG II 31,13f.; CG IV 48,17f.
142. "Heil als innerweltliche Entweltlichung", p.308.
143. CG II 31,16-25; CG IV 48,22-49,6.
144. Ibid., pp.309,313.
145. Ibid., p.313.
146. Cf. the description of the Holy Spirit raising the prone Gnostic in G Tr CG I 30,16-23.
147. "Gnostic Eschatology", p.150.



148. Trim Prot CG XIII 48, 11-35.
149. G Egypt CG III 66, 2-8. The number "five" however is missing in CG IV 78, 4f. Böhlig-Wisse, The Gospel of the Egyptians, p. 197, suggest that CG III added it perhaps due to a familiarity with five sacraments in Gnosticism.

### CONCLUSION

We are now in a position to attempt to answer the questions posed at the outset: (1) is the Apocryphon a unity? Can we discover which version or recension is nearest the original and what the precise relationship is of the Apocryphon to Irenaeus adversus haereses I 29 (and I 30)? (2) To what extent can we detect signs of Christianization or de-Christianization? Is the work pre-Christian? (3) What is its precise relationship to Valentinianism?

As a result of our literary-critical and theological analysis we argued in the first two chapters on the theogony and cosmogony of the Apocryphon, Irenaeus adv. haer. I 29 and related texts, that one could not determine which version of the Apocryphon was nearest the original in entire independence of Irenaeus' account. The best explanation of the similarities and differences arose out of assuming that Irenaeus' account represented an earlier and less developed form of the main traditions found in the Apocryphon, and that the Apocryphon differed from it in that it added traditions, combined figures who were distinct in the original and in Irenaeus' account, played down the cruder mythological elements and rearranged the order of events, all in accordance with its own theological purpose and tendency. Contrary to Giversen's hypothesis, we found that the short recension, particularly as represented by CG III, was nearest the original and closest to Irenaeus' account, while the long recension had evidently misunderstood or

reinterpreted features in the short, added material peculiar to itself, and generally represented an attempt both to tidy up inconsistencies in the short and give a more spiritual interpretation. These tendencies to creative reinterpretation, the addition of independent traditions and spiritualisation we found confirmed in the remainder of the Apocryphon. However, at times the long recension did preserve a more original tradition (e.g. the revelation discourse), and thus all the versions have to be taken into account in any attempt to get back to the original. We also noted that similar material in related texts (e.g. the Gospel of the Egyptians, the Trimorphic Protennoia) appeared to be dependent on the Apocryphon, and in particular on its long recension rather than vice versa.

In Chapters three, four and five we discussed in more general theological terms the relationship of the Apocryphon to Irenaeus adv. haer. I 30 and related texts. We analysed respectively the anthropological, soteriological and eschatological motifs, noting the way in which the Apocryphon selected and treated events in the reinterpretation of Genesis 1 - 7, which forms the core of its anthropology and soteriology, to express its own particular understanding in terms of Heilsgeschichte of the central paradox of Gnostic experience: the awareness of being elect, whether expressed in terms of the divine image or power of light or spark or seed or substance, and yet trapped in the body and matter, governed by sex and the passions,

subject to Fate and death. Alongside the central theme of the light-power in man via the Demiurge, which unites the Apocryphon with the systems of the Ophites of adv. haer. I 30 and the Valentinians, there is nevertheless the need for redemption. The light-power is not enough: the Gnostic needs a Revealer/Redeemer. The Apocryphon expresses this in terms of primal, continuous and decisive revelation, represented by the figures of Barbelo, the Epinoia and the Saviour/Pronoia/Christ respectively. The prologue, revelation discourse of the long recension, and epilogue which involve the last-named are linked with the main exposition in that he/she appears to be identified with Barbelo. Thus the revelation discourse does belong to the Apocryphon in its present form and has been mistakenly omitted by the short recension.

The varieties of eschatology reflect the varied traditions incorporated in the Apocryphon, the "Sethian" reworking (involving heavenly Seth and the four aeons) suggesting an eternal distinction between the redeemed souls, the catechetical section on the destinies of the souls (which may ultimately be of Jewish origin but is clearly Gnostic here) apparently being unaware of such a distinction. However the eschatological material has also been selected to express the paradox of Gnostic existence, the "Now" and the "Not Yet". Thus, despite the variety of (not always consistent) traditions, the Apocryphon does have its own distinctive theology which has led it to its particular selection

of material and the interpretation of it. This theological tendency is particularly evident in its reinterpretation of Sophia and her redeeming role and its ambivalent view of Ialdabaoth.

Secondly, on the question of Christianization, although the frame story and the question and answer pattern of the exposition are evidently Christian whereas the exposition, despite New Testament allusions, is apparently uninfluenced by Christianity, we have attempted to argue that in fact many of the figures and motifs are best understood in the context of early Christian speculation about the Person of Christ on the basis of the Old Testament and contemporary Hellenistic Jewish ideas. The Gnostics have used the same material but with very different presuppositions and results. The versions of the Apocryphon betray very little evidence of progressive Christianization or de-Christianization in any consistent sense: the evidence is mixed. But finally, there may indeed be some evidence to suggest that not only did the Apocryphon or its underlying traditions have some influence on Valentinianism in both its original and developed forms as regards cosmology, anthropology and soteriology, but that conversely the Apocryphon, and in particular its long recension, betrays signs of acquaintance with Valentinianism.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

(1) Primary Sources

Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha, see Lipsius-Bonnet.

Adam, A., Texte zum Manichäismus (Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen 175), Berlin 1954, 1969<sup>2</sup>.

Allberry, C.R.C., A Manichaean Psalm-Book: Part II (Manichaean Manuscripts in the Chester Beatty Collection vol.II), Stuttgart 1938.

Andreas, F.C., Henning, W., "Mitteliranische Manichaica aus Chinesische - Turkestan I," Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1932, 175-222

Baynes, C.A., A Coptic Gnostic Treatise contained in the Codex Brucianus (Bruce MS.96. Bod.Lib., Oxford), Cambridge 1933.

Bezold, C., (trans.) Die Schatzhöhle, Leipzig 1883.

Böhlig, A., Das Ägypterevangelium von Nag Hammadi (Göttinger Orientforschungen VI Reihe, Hellenistica Band I), Wiesbaden 1974.

Böhlig, A., Labib, P., (eds.) Koptisch-gnostische Apokalypsen aus Codex V von Nag Hammadi im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo (Sonderband der Wissenschaftlichen Zeitschrift der Martin-Luther-Universität, Halle-Wittenberg), Halle 1963.

Böhlig, A., Labib, P., (eds.) Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel aus Codex II von Nag Hammadi im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo (Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Institut für Orientforschung, Veröffentlichung No.58), Berlin 1962.

Böhlig, A., Wisse, F. (eds.), Nag Hammadi Codices III, 2 and IV, 2: The Gospel of the Egyptians (Nag Hammadi Studies vol. IV), Leiden 1975.

Bullard, R.A., The Hypostasis of the Archons, the Coptic Text with Translation and Commentary (Patristische Texte und Studien 10), Berlin 1970.

Charles, R. H. (ed) The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English (2 vols.), Oxford 1913.

Ciasca, A., (ed.) Sacrorum Bibliorum Fragmenta Coptosahidica Musei Borgiani (4 vols.), Rome 1885-9.

Clemens Alexandrinus, Stromata I-VI ed. O.Stählin GCS 15, Leipzig 1906.

De Resurrectione (Epistula ad Rheginum) eds. Malinine, M., Puech, H.-C., Quispel, G., Till, W., adiuvantibus Wilson, R.McL., Zandee, J., Zürich/Stuttgart 1963.

Doresse, J.(ed.), "'Le Livre sacré du grand Esprit invisible' ou 'L'Évangile des Égyptiens'", Journal Asiatique 254 (1966), 316-435; 256 (1968), 289-386.

Epiphanius of Salamis, Panarion ed. K.Holl, GCS 25,31,37, Leipzig 1915-1933.

Epistula Iacobi Apocrypha eds. Malinine, M., Puech, H.-C., Quispel, G., Till, W.C., Kasser, R., adiuvantibus Wilson, R.McL., Zandee, J., Zürich/Stuttgart 1968.

Evangelium veritatis eds. Malinine, M., Puech, H.-C., Quispel, G., Zürich 1956, id. and Till, W.C., Evangelium veritatis Supplementum, Zürich 1961.

The Facsimile Edition of the Nag Hammadi Codices, Leiden 1972-1977

Filastrius Brixienensis, Diversarum Hereseon Liber, ed. F.Marx, CSEL 38, Vienna 1898.

Gibson, M.D. "The Book of the Rolls", Apocrypha Arabica (Studia Sinaitica VIII).

Ginza, Der Schatz oder das grosse Buch der Mandäer trans. M.Lidzbarski, Göttingen/Leipzig 1925.

Giversen, S.(ed.), Apocryphon Johannis: The Coptic Text of the Apocryphon Johannis in the Nag Hammadi Codex II with Translation, Introduction and Commentary (Acta Theologia Danica vol. V), Copenhagen 1963.

Hegemonius, Acta Archelai ed. C.H.Beeson GCS 16, Leipzig 1906.

Hennecke, E., Schneemelcher, W., (English trans. ed. R.McL.Wilson) New Testament Apocrypha (2 vols.), London 1963-1965.

Hippolytus Romanus, Refutatio omnium haeresium ed. P.Wendland, GCS 26, Leipzig 1916.



- Irenaeus Lugdunensis, Adversus haereses ed. W.W. Harvey, Cambridge 1857 (cited according to Massuet-Stieren).
- Janssens, Y. (trans.), "Le Codex XIII de Nag Hammadi", Muséon 87 (1974), 341-413.
- Krause, M., Labib, P., (eds.) Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes im Koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo (Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo, Koptische Reihe, Band 1) Wiesbaden 1962.
- Krause, M., (ed.) Die Paraphrase des Seem, Der Zweite Logos des Grossen Seth, id. and Girgis, V., Die drei Stelen des Seth in Altheim, F., Stiehl, R., Christentum am Roten Meer, 2, Berlin/New York 1973, 2-151, 180-229.
- Kropp, A., Ausgewählte koptische Zaubertexte (3 vols.), Brussels 1930-1931.
- Labib, P., Coptic Gnostic Papyri in the Coptic Museum at Old Cairo, vol. 1, Cairo 1956.
- Lipsius, R.A., Bonnet, M., Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha (2 parts in 3 vols.) 3rd reprinting, Darmstadt 1959.
- Malan, S.C. (trans.), The Book of Adam and Eve, London 1882.
- Ménard, J.E., L'Évangile selon Philippe, Paris 1967.
- Midrash Rabbah, trans. and ed. under the direction of I.Epstein (9 vols), London 1935-1952.
- Midrash Tehillim: the Midrash on Psalms, trans. W.G.Braude (2 vols.) Yale Judaica Series, vol. 13, New Haven 1959.
- Nock, A.D., Festugière, A.J., Corpus Hermeticum (4 vols.), Paris 1960.
- Origenes, Contra Celsum, ed. P.Koetschau, GCS 3, Leipzig 1899, ed. and trans. H.Chadwick, Oxford 1953.
- Polotsky, H.J., Böhlig, A., (eds. and trans.) Kephalaia I, 1 (Manichäische Handschriften der Staatlichen Museen Berlin), Stuttgart 1940.
- Preisendanz, K., (ed.) Papyri Graecae Magicae (2 vols.), Leipzig 1928-1931.
- Preuschen, E., "Die apokryphen gnostischen Adamschriften aus dem Armenischen übersetzt und untersucht", in Festgruss Bernhard Stade, Giessen 1900, 162-252.
- Priscillian, Tractates, ed. G.Schepss CSEL 18, Prague / Vienna/ Leipzig 1889.

- Pseudoclementines, I, Homilien, ed. B.Rehm GCS 42, Berlin 1953.
- Pseudo-Tertullian, Adversus omnes haereses, ed. A.Kroymann, CSEL 47, Vienna 1906.
- Robinson, J.M. (ed.), The Nag Hammadi Library in English  
Translated by Members of the Coptic Gnostic Library  
Project of the Institute for Antiquity and  
Christianity, Leiden 1977.
- Sagnard, F.-M.-M. (ed.), Clement d'Alexandrie, Extraits de  
Théodote (Sources Chrétienues 23) Nouveau tirage,  
Paris 1970.
- Schenke, G. (trans.), "'Die dreigestaltige Protennoia': Eine  
gnostische Offenbarungsrede aus dem Fund von Nag  
Hammadi", Theologische Literaturzeitung 99(1974),  
cols. 731-46.
- Schenke, H.-M. (trans.), "Das Ägypter-Evangelium aus Nag-Hammadi  
-Codex III" NTS 16 (1969/70), 196-208.
- Schmidt, C. (ed.), MacDermot, V.(trans.), Pistis Sophia (Nag  
Hammadi Studies vol.IX), Leiden 1978.
- Schmidt, C. (ed.), MacDermot, V.(trans.), The Books of Jeu and the  
Untitled Text in the Bruce Codex (Nag Hammadi Studies  
vol. XIII), Leiden 1978.
- Scott, W., Ferguson, A.S., Hermetica (4 vols.), Oxford 1924-1936.
- Tertullian, Adversus Valentinianos, ed A.Kroymann, CSEL 47,  
Vienna 1906.
- Theodore bar Konai, Liber Scholiorum ed. A.Scher CSCO 69, Louvain  
1960, ed. and trans. H.Pognon, Inscriptions  
mandaites des coupes de Khouabir, Paris 1898.
- Theodoret, Haereticarum Fabularum Compendium, Migne, Patrologia  
Graeca, vol.83.
- Till, W.C. (ed.), Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus  
Berolinensis 8502 (Texte und Untersuchungen 60, V  
Reihe, Band 5), Berlin 1955; 2 Auflage, H.-M. Schenke  
(ed.), Berlin 1972.
- Tractatus Tripartitus, Pars I, De Supernis eds. Kasser, R., Malinine,  
Puech, H.-C., Quispel, G., Zandee, J., adiuvantibus  
Vycichl, W., Wilson, R.McL., Bern 1973; Pars II,  
De Creatione Hominis, Pars III De Generibus Tribus,  
id., Bern 1975.
- Völker, W., Quellen zur Geschichte der christlichen Gnosis  
(Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen - und dogmengeschicht-  
licher Quellenschriften 5), Tübingen 1932.

Wessely, C., Griechische und koptische Texte theologischen Inhalts IV (Studien zur Palaeographie und Papyruskunde XV), Leipzig 1914.

Wilson, R.McL., The Gospel of Philip, London 1962.

## (2) Secondary Sources

Adam, A., "Neuere Literatur zum Problem der Gnosis", GGA 215 (1963), 22-46.

Arai, S., "Zur Christologie des Apokryphons des Johannes", NTS 15 (1968/69). 302-18.

Bianchi, U. (ed.), Le Origini dello gnosticismo, Studies in the History of Religions (Supplements to Numen XII), Leiden 1967.

Black, M., The Scrolls and Christian Origins, Edinburgh/London 1961.

Böhlig, A., Review of Giversen, Apocryphon Johannis, Bibliotheca Orientalis 24 (1967), 175-7.

Böhlig, A., "Der jüdische und judenchristliche Hintergrund in gnostischen Texten von Nag Hammadi" in Le Origini, 109-40.

Böhlig, A., Mysterion und Wahrheit (AGSJU VI), Leiden 1968.

Bonner, C., "An Amulet of the Ophite Gnostics", Commemorative Studies in Honor of Leslie Shear, Hesperia, Suppl. 8 Athens 1949, 43-6.

Bonner, C., Studies in Magical Amulets, University of Michigan Studies, Humanistic Series vol. XLIX, Ann Arbor 1950.

Borsch, F.H., The Christian and Gnostic Son of Man (Studies in Biblical Theology, Second Series, 14), London 1970.

Bousset, W., Hauptprobleme der Gnosis, (FRLANT 10), Göttingen 1907.

Bultmann, R., The Gospel of John, Oxford 1971.

Bultmann, R., Primitive Christianity in its Contemporary Setting, London 1962.

Bultmann, R., Theology of the New Testament (2 vols.), London 1952-1955.

Burkitt, F.C., Church and Gnosis, Cambridge 1932.

Colpe, C., Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule (FRLANT 60), Göttingen 1961.

Davies, W.D., "Paul on Flesh and Spirit" in The Scrolls and the New Testament, ed. K.Stendahl, London 1958, 157-82.

Dodd, C.H., According to the Scriptures, London 1952.

- Dodd, C.H., The Bible and the Greeks, London 1935, 1954<sup>2</sup>.
- Doresse, J., "Nouveaux textes gnostiques coptes découverts en Haut-Égypte: La bibliothèque de Chenoboskion", Vig. Chr. 2 (1948), 137-60.
- Foerster, W., "Das Apocryphon des Johannes" in Gott und die Götter: Festgabe für Erich Fascher zum 60. Geburtstag, Berlin 1958, 134-41.
- Foerster, W., Gnosis: A Selection of Gnostic Texts (Eng. trans. ed. R.McL. Wilson) (2 vols.), Oxford, 1972-1974.
- Foerster, W., "Die Grundzüge der ptolemaeischen Gnosis", NTS 6 (1959/60), 16-31.
- Foerster, W., "Das System des Basilides", NTS 9 (1962/63), 233-55.
- Ginzberg, L., "Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvatern", Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums (1899/1900), 1-131.
- Ginzberg, L., The Legends of the Jews (7 vols.), Philadelphia 1909-38.
- Grant, R.M., The Early Christian Doctrine of God, Charlottesville, Virginia 1966.
- Grant, R.M., Gnosticism, An Anthology, London 1961.
- Haardt, R., "Das universaleschatologische Vorstellungsgut in der Gnosis" in Vom Messias zum Christos: Die Fülle der Zeit in religionsgeschichtlicher und theologischer Sicht, ed. K. Schubert, Vienna 1964, 315-36.
- Haenchen, E., "Aufbau und Theologie des Poimandres", ZTK 53 (1956), 170-91.
- Haenchen, E., "Gab es eine vorchristliche Gnosis?" ZTK 49 (1952), 316-49.
- Hauschild, W.-D., Gottes Geist und der Mensch, Munich 1972.
- Helmbold, A.K., "The Apocryphon of John", JNES 25 (1966), 259-72.
- Helmbold, A.K., "The Apocryphon of John: A Case Study in Literary Criticism", JETS 13 (1970), 173-9.
- Janssens, Y., "L'Apocryphon de Jean", Muséon 83 (1970), 157-65; 84 (1971) 43-64, 403-32.
- Janssens, Y., "Le thème de la fornication des anges", in Le Origini, 488-94.

- Jervell, J., Imago Dei: Gen.1:26f in Spätjudentum, in der Gnosis und in den paulinischen Briefen (FRLANT 76), Göttingen 1960.
- Jonas, H., Gnosis und spätantiker Geist I, Göttingen 1934, 1964<sup>3</sup>, II, 1, Göttingen 1954.
- Jonas, H., The Gnostic Religion, Boston 1963.
- Jonas, H., "The Secret Books of the Egyptian Gnostics", Journal of Religion 42 (1962), 262-73.
- Kasser, R., "Bibliothèque gnostique I: Le Livre Secret de Jean = Apokryphon Iōannou", RThPH 14 (1964), 140-50.
- Kasser, R., "Citations des grands prophètes bibliques dans les textes gnostiques coptes" in Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts in honour of Pahor Labib, ed. M.Krause, (Nag Hammadi Studies, vol. VI), Leiden 1975, 56-64.
- Kasser, R., "Le 'Livre Secret de Jean' dans ses différentes formes textuelles coptes", Muséon 77 (1964), 5-16.
- Kelly, J.N.D., Early Christian Doctrines, 5th ed., London 1977.
- Klijn, A.F.J., Seth in Jewish, Christian and Gnostic Literature (Supplements to Numen XLVI), Leiden 1977.
- Kragerud, A., "Apocryphon Johannis: En formanalyse" Norsk Teologisk Tidsskrift 66 (1965), 15-38.
- Krause, M., "Das literarische Verhältnis des Eugnostos-Briefes zur Sophia Jesu Christi: zur Auseinandersetzung der Gnosis mit dem Christentum" Mullus: Festschrift Theodor Klauser, (JbAC Ergänzungsband 1) Münster 1964, 215-23.
- Krause, M., "Der Stand der Veröffentlichung der Nag Hammadi-Texte" in Le Origini, 61-88.
- Leipoldt, J., Gressmann, W. (eds.), Umwelt des Urchristentums I, Berlin 1971.
- MacRae, G.W., "The Coptic Gnostic Apocalypse of Adam", The Heythrop Journal 6 (1965), 27-35.
- MacRae, G.W., "Discourses of the Gnostic Revealer", in Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Gnosticism, Stockholm, August 20-25 1973, 11-22.
- MacRae, G.W., "The Ego Proclamation in Gnostic Sources" in The Trial of Jesus: Cambridge Studies in honour of C.F.D. Moule, ed. E. Bammel (Studies in Biblical Theology, Second Series, 13), London 1970, 129-34.
- Macrae, G.W., "The Jewish Background of the Gnostic Sophia Myth" Novum Testamentum XII (1970), 86-101.



- MacRae, G.W., "Sleep and Awakening in Gnostic Texts", in Le Origini, 496-507.
- Nilsson, M.P., "Sophia-Prunikos" Eranos (Acta Philologica Suecana) 45 (1947), 169-72.
- Pagels, E., "The Valentinian Claim to Esoteric Exegesis of Romans as Basis for Anthropological Theory" Vig.Chr. 26 (1972), 241-58.
- Pearson, B.A., "Jewish Haggadic Traditions in the Testimony of Truth from Nag Hammadi (CG IX,3)" in Ex Orbe Religionum I (Supplements to Numen XXI), Leiden 1972, 457-70.
- Peel, M.L., "Gnostic Eschatology and the New Testament", Novum Testamentum XII (1970), 141-65.
- Perkins, P., "Ireneus and the Gnostics: Rhetoric and Composition in Adversus Haereses Book I", Vig.Chr. 30 (1976), 193-200.
- Peterson, E., "Einige Bemerkungen zum Hamburger Papyrus-fragment der Acta Pauli", Vig.Chr. 3 (1949), 149-59.
- Puech, H.-C., "The Apocryphon of John" in Hennecke, E., Schneemelcher, W., New Testament Apocrypha I, London 1963, 314-31.
- Puech, H.-C., En quête de la Gnose I: La Gnose et le temps, Paris 1978.
- Puech, H.-C., "Fragments retrouvés de l'Apocalypse d'Allogène" in Mélanges Franz Cumont, II, Brussels 1936, 938-62 (= En quête de la Gnose, I, 271-300).
- Puech, H.-C., Doresse, J., "Nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Égypte", Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, 1948, 87-95.
- Puech, H.-C., "Les nouveaux écrits gnostiques découverts en Haut-Égypte" in Coptic Studies in Honor of W.E.Crum (Bulletin of the Byzantine Institute 2), Boston 1950, 91-154.
- Quispel, G., "La conception de l'homme dans la gnose valentinienne", Eranos Jahrbuch XV (1947), 249-86 (= Gnostic Studies I, 37-57).
- Quispel, G., Gnosis als Weltreligion, 2 Auflage, Zürich 1972.
- Quispel, G., "Der gnostische Anthropos und die jüdische Tradition", Eranos Jahrbuch XXII (1953), Zürich 1954, 195-234 (= Gnostic Studies I, 173-95).

- Quispel, G., Gnostic Studies vol. I, Istanbul 1974.
- Quispel, G., "Origen and the Valentinian Gnosis", Vig.Chr. 28 (1974), 29-42.
- Quispel, G., "The Original Doctrine of Valentine", Vig.Chr. 1 (1947), 43-73 (= Gnostic Studies I, 27-36).
- Reitzenstein, R., Das iranische Erlösungsmysterium, Bonn 1921.
- Reitzenstein, R., Poimandres, Leipzig 1904.
- Robinson, J.M., "The Coptic Gnostic Library Today", NTS 14 (1967/68), 356-401.
- Rudolph, K., "Gnosis und Gnostizismus, eine Forschungsbericht", ThR 34 (1969), 121-75, 181-231, 358-61; ThR 36 (1971), 1-61.
- Rudolph, K., Die Gnosis: Wesen und Geschichte einer spätantiken Religion, Leipzig 1977, Göttingen 1978.
- Rudolph, K., "Ein Grundtyp gnostischer Urmensch Spekulation", ZRGG 9 (1957), 1-20.
- Sagnard, F.-M.-M., La gnose valentinienne et le témoignage de S.Irénée, Paris 1947.
- Schenke, H.-M., Der Gott "Mensch" in der Gnosis: Eine religionsgeschichtlicher Beitrag zur Diskussion über die paulinische Anschauung von der Kirche als Leib Christi, Göttingen 1962.
- Schenke, H.-M., "Nag Hammadi Studien I: Das literarische Problem des Apokryphon Johannis", ZRGG 14 (1962), 57-63; "Nag-Hamadi Studien II: Das System der Sophia Jesu Christi" *ibid.*, 263-78; "Nag-Hamadi Studien III: Die Spitze des dem Apokryphon Johannis und der Sophia Jesu Christi zugrundeliegenden gnostischen Systems", *ibid.*, 352-61.
- Schenke H.-M., "Die neutestamentliche Christologie und der gnostische Erlöser" in Gnosis und neues Testament ed. K.-W.Tröger, Berlin 1973, 205-29.
- Schmidt, C., "Ein vorirenäisches gnostisches Originalwerk in koptischen Sprache", Sitzungsberichte der kgl. preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin 1896, 839-47.
- Schmidt, C., "Irenäus und seine Quelle in adv.haer. I 29" in Philotesia. Paul Kleinert zum 70 Geburtstag dargebracht, Berlin 1907, 317-36.
- Schmithals, W., Gnosticism in Corinth (trans. J.E.Steely), Nashville/New York 1971.



- Scholem, G., "Die Vorstellung von Golem in ihrem tellurischen und magischen Beziehungen", Eranos Jahrbuch XXII (1953) Zurich 1954, 237-43.
- Scholer, D.M., Nag Hammadi Bibliography 1948-1969 (Nag Hammadi Studies I), Leiden 1971.
- Schotttroff, L. "Animae naturaliter salvandae: zum Problem der himmlischen Herkunft des Gnostikers", in W.Eltester (ed.) Christentum und Gnosis (BZNW 37), 1969, 65-97.
- Schotttroff, L., Der Glaubende und die feindliche Welt (WMANT 37) Neukirchen 1970.
- Schotttroff, L., "Heil als innerweltliche Entweltlichung: Der gnostische Hintergrund der johanneischen Vorstellung vom Zeitpunkt der Erlösung", Novum Testamentum XI (1969), 294-317.
- Schweizer, E., "Gegenwart des Geistes und eschatologische Hoffnung bei Zarathustra, spätjüdischen Gruppen, Gnostikern und den Zeugen des neuen Testaments" in The Background to the New Testament and its Eschatology (Studies in honour of C.H.Dodd), Cambridge 1956, 482-508.
- Segal, A.F. Two Powers in Heaven: Early Rabbinic Reports about Christianity and Gnosticism (Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity XXV), Leiden 1978.
- Stead, G.C., "The Valentinian Myth of Sophia", JTS n.s.20 (1969), 75-104.
- Tardieu, M. "Les livres mis sous le nom de Seth et les Séthiens de l'hérésiologie" in Gnosis and Gnosticism ed. M.Krause (Nag Hammadi Studies vol.VIII), Leiden 1977, 204-10.
- Stead, G.C., Trois mythes gnostiques: Adam, Eros et les animaux d'Égypte dans un écrit de Nag Hammadi (II,5), Paris 1974.
- Tröger, K.-W.(ed.) Gnosis und neues Testament, Berlin 1973.
- Van den Broek, R., "The Authentikos Logos: A New Document of Christian Platonism", Vig.Chr. 33 (1979) 260-86.
- Van Unnik, W.C., "Die geöffneten Himmel in der Offenbarungsvision der Apokryphons des Johannes", in Apophoreta: Festschrift Ernst Haenchen (BZNW 30) 1964, 269-80.
- Van Unnik, W.C., "Der Neid in der Paradiesgeschichte nach einigen gnostischen Texten", in Essays on the Nag Hammadi Texts in honour of Alexander Böhlig (Nag Hammadi Studies vol.III), Leiden 1972, 120-32.

- Van Unnik, W.C., Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings (Studies in Biblical Theology, 30), London 1960.
- Wedderburn, A.J.M., "Philo's Heavenly Man", Novum Testamentum XV (1973), 301-26.
- Welburn, A.J., "The Identity of the Archons in the 'Apocryphon Johannis'", Vig. Chr. 32 (1978), 241-54.
- Wilson, R.McL. "The Early History of the Exegesis of Gen. 1: 26", Studia Patristica 1 (Texte und Untersuchungen 63), 420-37.
- Wilson, R.McL., Gnosis and the New Testament, Oxford 1968.
- Wilson, R.McL., The Gnostic Problem, London 1958.
- Wilson, R.McL., "A Note on the Gospel of Truth (33.8-9)", NTS 9 (1962/63), 295-8.
- Wilson, R.McL., "The Spirit in Gnostic Literature" in Christ and the Spirit in the New Testament, ed. B.Lindars and S.Smalley in honour of C.F.D. Moule, Cambridge 1973, 345-55.
- Wilson, R.McL., "The Trials of a Translator: Some Translation Problems in the Nag Hammadi Texts" in Les Textes de Nag Hammadi ed J.E.Ménard: Colloque du Centre d'Histoire des Religions, Strasbourg 23-25 Octobre 1974 (Nag Hammadi Studies vol. VII), Leiden 1975, 32-40.
- Wilson, R.McL., "The Trimorphic Protennoia" in Gnosis and Gnosticism (Nag Hammadi Studies vol. VIII), Leiden 1977, 50-4.
- Wisse, F., "The Nag Hammadi Library and the Heresiologists", Vig. Chr. 25 (1971), 205-23.
- Wisse, F., "The Redeemer Figure in the Paraphrase of Shem", Novum Testamentum XII (1970), 130-140.
- Zaehner, R.C., Zurvan: A Zoroastrian Dilemma, Oxford 1955.
- Zandee, J., "Gnostic Ideas on the Fall and Salvation", Numen 11 (1964), 13-74.
- Zandee J., "Gnostische Eschatologie" in X Internationaler Kongress für Religionsgeschichte, 11-17 September 1960 in Marburg, Marburg 1961, 94-5.